THE

LABOUR MONTHLY

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

Editor : R. PALME DUTT

Volume 19 September, 1937 Number 9

The T.U.C. & Unity

articles by

JOHN STRACHEY

JOHN A. MAHON

&c.

PRICE SIXPENCE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOVIET GEOGRAPHY

Second Edition
Revised and re-set

N. MIKHAYLOV

The new industrial and economic distributions of the U.S.S.R.

With 36 text illustrations

10s. 6d. net

METHUEN & CO. LTD., 36 Essex St., W.C.2

MARX MEMORIAL LIBRARY AND WORKERS' SCHOOL

WINTER SESSION
Begins October 4th, 1937

Enrolments, Monday, September 27th, to Friday, October 1st.
10 a.m. to 9.30 p.m.

EVENING CLASSES on POLITICAL ECONOMY: DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM: HISTORY OF THE LABOUR MOVEMENT: LENINISM: INTRODUCTION TO MARXISM: PUBLIC SPEAKING: YOUTH AND MARXISM: HISTORICAL POSITION AND PRESENT PROBLEMS OF WOMEN: RUSSIAN LANGUAGE.

REFERENCE LIBRARY of over 3,000 Marxist and other books available for students.

Popular Lectures every Sunday evening.

POSTAL COURSES and local DISCUSSION CIRCLES arranged on request.

Prospectus on application to the Secretary,
MARX HOUSE,
37a and 38 Clerkenwell Green, E.C.1.

★ Professor Laski
has said:

"I find the DAILY WORKER a valuable help to the interpretation of events. Particularly its news of Spain and of Soviet Russia gives information not available elsewhere. I like its admirable book reviews, and I find much help in Mr. Strachey's articles."

★ No one in the Labour Movement

can afford to be without the DAILY WORKER. From many newsagents, or by post from the DAILY WORKER, Nelson Place, Cayton Street, London, E.C.1.

Postal rates: Early delivery, Weekly 10d. Monthly, 3/4d. Yearly £2. Late delivery: Weekly 7d. and pro rata. Foreign and British Empire, 3/- Monthly.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

VOLUME 19 SEPTEMBER 1937 NUMBER 9

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

CONTENTS

The Norwich Trades Union Congress - - Page 523
By JOHN A. MAHON

The Abdication of the Labour Party - - - ,, 534
By JOHN STRACHEY

China—The Second Phase - - - - - ,, 541
By RICHARD GOODMAN

Catalonia & Communism - - - - - - ,, 548
By JUAN COMORERA

Holidays with Pay: A Vital Issue - - - ,, 560
By H. S. GORDON

Rearmament & Labour Conditions - - - ,, 564
By JOHN KNIGHT

Lenin and Gorky. Letters - - - - - ,, 570

Book Reviews - - - - - - - ,, 577

Africa: A Confused Argument - *By* Reginald Bridgeman
Forerunner of Dialectical Materialism - - *By* R. Pascal
Women To-day - - - - - - *By* Tamara Rust
A Book with a Purpose - - - - *By* T. Campbell
The Struggle for Peace - - - - *By* Gore Graham

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Labour Monthly

Editorial and Publishing Offices :
7 JOHN STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.
Telephone : HOLBORN 6656

¶ The Editor of *The Labour Monthly* invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him or undertake to enter into correspondence regarding rejected contributions, although every endeavour will be made to return the same when a stamped and addressed envelope for that purpose is enclosed.

1937 : *Subscription Rates*
[PAID IN ADVANCE]

British Isles :

One year - 7/- Six months - 3/6

Abroad :

One year 8/- or $2.00 Six months 4/- or $1.00

American Subscription Representative :—Philip Novick, 2800 Bronx Park East, New York City, U.S.A.

South African Representative :—The People's Bookshop, 30 Kirk Street, Johannesburg, South Africa.

The Labour Monthly is also obtainable wholesale from The Workers' Bookshop, 49 Farringdon Road, E.C.1.

Advertisement Rates : £8 8s. od. per cover page and pro rata. £5 5s. od. per page (ordinary position) and pro rata (⅛th page minimum).

BOUND VOLUMES

Volume I	£5 5*s.* od.	*Volume X*	£1 10*s.* od.
Volume II	£3 3*s.* od.	*Volume XI*	£1 1*s.* od.
Volume III	£3 3*s.* od.	*Volume XII*	15*s.* 6*d.*
Volume IV	£3 3*s.* od.	*Volume XIII*	15*s.* 6*d.*
Volume V	£3 3*s.* od.	*Volume XIV*	10*s.* 6*d.*
Volume VI	£2 2*s.* od.	*Volume XV*	10*s.* 6*d.*
Volume VII	£2 2*s.* od.	*Volume XVI*	10*s.* 6*d.*
Volume VIII	£2 2*s.* od.	*Volume XVII*	10*s.* 6*d.*
Volume XI	£1 10*s.* od.	*Volume XVIII*	10*s.* 6*d.*

Loose copies of last five volumes can be exchanged for a bound volume for 4s. 6d. Single loose copies are available of almost every issue except for 1921.

The articles in *The Labour Monthly* are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NORWICH TRADES UNION CONGRESS

By JOHN A. MAHON

WAR is on in Europe and Asia. Fascism has passed to military measures in its struggle to destroy democracy and the Labour Movement, and to make the world safe for capital. The tide of resistance to fascism rises steadily, the struggle for working class unity is at the highest level yet reached. These facts dominate Norwich.

A great opportunity rests with Congress. Since the Citrine-Bevin group shows no sign of changing its disastrous policy, it falls to Congress to make decisions which will encourage the working class of the world in the battle against fascism and reaction.

All facts must be faced, however unpleasant they may be. Those who conceal them do a great disservice to trade unionism.

Amid the flux of events the National Government steadfastly pursues its class aim—to weaken democracy everywhere, especially at home, to secure the dictatorship of capital, and to gather the forces of reaction for the long desired armed onslaught on the Soviet Union. For over a year this skilful and malignant government, aided by the mistaken policy of Citrine and Bevin, has deluded democracy into blockading Republican Spain. Now, hoping it has finally broken the heart of the League of Nations, it seeks to realise a Western Pact, to turn the forces of Hitler against the U.S.S.R. Preparing for the awakening of democracy at home, it maintains Mosley and systematically restricts democratic liberty. It uses the national hatred of fascism to force through rearmament and prepare for conscription, while aiding the aggression policy of Hitler and Mussolini.

The Labour leadership, instead of leading the working class against the National Government, appeals to the government to be decent and play the game for democracy. The refusal to vote against the Arms Estimates dismayed thousands of Labour Party members, who were hoping that the campaign for the Short Term programme would revive the movement, but who feel instinctively that the decision not to oppose the government on its war policy has torpedoed the campaign.

How will Congress face up to this situation in which the enemies of the working class threaten it with the loss of all that has been gained by generations of struggle, while the Citrine-Bevin group at Transport

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

House now divides the official movement as well as maintaining the division between Labour and Communist ?

Reformist procedure will present the economic questions, Spain and peace, class unity, and the advance to power, separated one from another, without any fundamental analysis of the whole class political situation of which each problem is an aspect. Only from such an analysis could be drawn, in the full light of discussion, a policy to advance working-class interests all along the line.

Lack of such an analysis aids the Citrine-Bevin group to conceal the contradictions and mistakes of its policy and to blur the question which history is putting on Congress agenda—is the British Labour Movement going to act as a political force in the interests of the working class, or to become a mere appendage of British capital ? On the answer to this question depends whether British Labour is to advance to Socialism or to give way to fascism.

Since Citrine and Bevin will propose a continuation of present policy, delegates can with advantage examine what results this policy has brought in the last year, a year which might have been British Labour's heroic year had the General Council been alive to either need or opportunity.

The workers' economic demands, registered by almost every union in the country, are—higher wages, the 40 hours, holidays with pay. The General Council took no measures to unite this movement and to direct it against the employers and the government. Each union executive was left to its own devices. Clinging to the decomposing corpse of " industrial peace " the executives contented themselves with the usual negotiating measures, and accepted hastily a few niggardly concessions.

On wages, the initiative thus abandoned by the General Council was seized by the capitalists, who have already secured the equivalent of a 5s. a week all-round wage reduction through the rise in the cost of living.

In 1936 some 4,000,000 workers received increases averaging 2s. per week. This process continued more slowly in 1937. The housewife now spends 35s. to buy food which in 1936 cost 30s. Flour went up from 7½d. to 9d., tea 1s. 4d. to 1s. 8d., sugar 2¼d. to 2½d., butter 10d. to 1s. 3d., cheese 7d. to 8d., and bread 8d. to 9d., so the very minimum reduction in purchasing power is 5s. per week. This has more than offset the advantages of wage increases.

Further price rises are guaranteed by the National Government's policy of taxes on food, Marketing Boards which fix retail prices high and manufacturers' rates low, and armament production at a double rate of profit, one for moneylenders and one for manufacturers. Seeing this, the employers want long term agreements. At this moment, with prices soaring and wages crawling, Transport House is maladroit enough

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to produce index figures showing that real wages are rising! The capitalist press gleefully quotes these figures. Let the General Council's research experts take them to the workers' homes when the wife comes back from shopping and the comments will perhaps convince them that their method of compiling the index needs revision.

No advance but a net loss, a loss increasing every week, is the year's result on the wages front.

American, French and Belgian workers have the 40-hour week, but not we, although depression continues in America, and France and Belgium are poorer countries than Britain. The General Council was content with memoranda and resolutions, but unfortunately committee work, however excellent it may be, does not induce the capitalists to pay up unless a mass movement is in action. When the London busmen made a fight for shorter hours they were given recognition in their strike, but other trade unionists were officially ordered to carry their passengers. The busmen were then ordered back to work, on worse than the *status quo*, their democratic machinery suspended and their leaders expelled. Such is the solitary achievement of Transport House on the hours front during the year. No wonder Léon Jouhaux, at the Warsaw meeting of the I.F.T.U. said to Citrine that the 40-hour week in France was being jeopardised by lack of progress in certain other countries.

The General Council missed the opportunity to secure holidays with pay this year. The government has made it clear that it will not help. It denies paid holidays to its own employees and opposed the proposal of an I.L.O. Convention. The I.L.O. reports that paid holidays are established by law for all wage earners in Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Finland, France, Italy, Latvia, Luxemburg, Mexico, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Spain, Sweden, U.S.S.R. and Venezuela, while the principle has been partially applied in Argentina, China, Columbia, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Haiti, Iraq, Irish Free State, Lithuania, Panama, Salvador, Switzerland, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Yugoslavia. The Irish Free State and Iraq accord the statutory right to paid holidays to all industrial workers.

So the General Council does no more than appeal to the social conscience of a government which unashamedly lags behind Latvia, Portugal and even fascist Italy!

What could have been done by a mass campaign is shown by the success of the 18,000 cable and engineering workers in south east London, and the 15,000 H.M.V. workers, who got their week's paid holiday this year. They so alarmed the Engineering Employers' Federation that, fearing the movement would spread, it swung round with an offer to its engineering employees of a week's holiday with pay *next* year.

On Spain, last year's T.U.C. was led by Citrine and Bevin to make the most serious mistake in its history. It supported " non-intervention."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A few days later it became clear that those who had given the impression that the French trade unions were supporting this policy had grossly deceived Congress. Planes and guns sent to Madrid last September would have defeated Franco before the foreign invasion could begin. Now Spain is invaded by German and Italian troops. Bombers destroyed Guernica, guns broke Bilbao's iron ring, warships bombarded Almeria, all were moved into position behind the screen of " non-intervention." At Valencia on the anniversary of the rising, the President of the Republic had to say " there is one thing worse than this war, and that is the attitude of the democratic governments." This " non-intervention " could not have continued for a single week had Labour acted to aid democracy in Spain. Labour allowed Citrine and Bevin to hold it back by the argument that there was danger of a European war. If German and Italian armies invade Spain is not that the beginning of war in Europe ? Are not Madrid and Bilbao European cities ? Do we require the bombing of Transport House by Nazi planes before we recognise war ? Precisely the failure to send arms to the legal Spanish government has begun war in Europe. More, it has begun world war, for the Japanese onslaught on China is planned in agreement with Berlin and Rome. True, Citrine and Bevin have found their policy untenable, and the L.S.I. and I.F.T.U. in June decided in favour of supplying arms to Republican Spain. But this decision has made no change in the practical attitude of the General Council, which does not realise that the time is long overdue for the use of the industrial power of the movement to make clear to Chamberlain that Labour will no longer agree to " manacle the hands of Spain while she is being strangled."

The shameful and horrible truth should be written down on the agenda paper by every delegate at Norwich—" for more than 12 months our Spanish comrades have held fascism back with their bodies, but the National Council of Labour has not organised a single meeting, conference, or protest strike against Britain's refusal to allow them arms."

The shortsightedness of Citrine and Bevin has also helped Eden to reduce the League to impotency. The sanctions half-heartedly applied against the aggression upon Abyssinia were not even considered against the agression upon Spain. A strange way to honour the lifework of Arthur Henderson and all the pledges made to make the League a bulwark of security and peace ! European war begun in Spain, a new Spain in China, the twilight of the League, such in twelve months are the heavy consequences of Labour's inaction on the advice of Citrine and Bevin.

For the trade unionist, unity is a vital principle. To defeat the employers 100 per cent. trade unionism is needed. Industrial unity requires political unity to represent its interests effectively. That is surely the A.B.C. of trade unionism and should be a guiding principle of the General Council.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The employers' demand for labour and the accumulation of 10 years discontent with the results of rationalisation provided favourable opportunities for advancing industrial unity by amalgamating the competing unions in each industry and launching a united recruitment campaign to win the unorganised millions for trade unionism.

The N.U.D.A.W. and Shop Assistants voted for amalgamation into one distributive workers' union. The M.F.G.B. decided to transform itself from a federation into a national union, a proposal the Communists worked out in detail ten years ago. In engineering and building the large unions again offered to absorb the others. That is all. The General Council could have got far more results if it had made a serious effort. It is the workers who will pay, by delayed wage increases, for the lack of leadership which has let another year slip by without unifying our trade unions.

On recruitment the General Council's outlook can only be described as archaic. A year in which the miners eliminate non-political unionism, Oxford Pressed Steel workers shut down the plant while they enrol every man, woman and youth into the union, 13,000 Clydeside apprentices go on strike, was ripe for a trade union crusade that would sweep Britain from end to end. What a wealth of talent and energy—speakers, writers, organisers, rank and filers, authors, film and theatre artists—would respond to a call from the General Council to put trade union propaganda over in a modern manner. But the General Council remains content with routine assistance to Trades Councils in spasmodic efforts, a half hearted attempt on Ford's, and the Tolpuddle award scheme. It is an excellent scheme, but more is needed from the leadership than recognition of individual effort. Now is the time for a united campaign with all working-class resources to wipe out non-unionism.

But Citrine and Bevin have been more concerned with denouncing unofficial strikes than with organising recruiting.

Citrine in *Labour* says unofficial strikes are caused by Communist intrigue. He gives no facts. Facts do not support his view. Here are details of the 31 important unofficial strikes in 1936 and 1937:

Industry.		*Issue.*		*Character.*	
Engineering	7	T. U. Rights	2	Offensive	5
		Wages	4	Defensive	2
		Conditions	2		
Aircraft	7	T. U. Rights	1	Defensive	7
		Conditions	7		
Passenger Transport	11	T. U. Rights	2	Offensive	6
		Wages	3	Defensive	5
		Conditions	9		
Others	6	T. U. Rights	1	Offensive	4
		Wages	4	Defensive	2
		Conditions	3		

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus, of the 31 strikes, 6 were for union rights, 11 for wage demands, and 21 were disputes on working conditions. Some strikes were on more than one issue. Fifteen were for positive demands and 16 were in resistance to employers' attacks. These figures show that it is the employers' policy which causes unofficial strikes. If Citrine really wants to investigate the problem he can easily organise a public enquiry and bring the aircraft workers, the Clydeside apprentices, the Leeds clothing workers, and the busmen from Oxford, Yorkshire, Scotland, Kent and Devon to tell the world why they struck.

By these anti-Communist slanders Citrine does the trade unions a real injury, since he conceals a serious weakness in the present agreements. They make no provision for the ceaseless changes in technique in production. With every such change employers seek an advantage. The agreement provides no defence for the worker, who has frequently either to accept a worsening of conditions or to take unofficial action. Let Citrine employ his talent for finding formulæ to construct one which, included in all agreements, would protect the workers from worsened conditions due to technical changes. That would do a lot to stop unofficial strikes.

The dominant influence of the General Council in the Labour Party has not been used to help forward political unity. A blunt "No" has been the reply to the Communist proposal for affiliation, no intermediate form to facilitate unity has been suggested, a new heresy hunt has been begun within the Labour Party.

Since the appeal by Dimitrov at the Communist World Congress two years ago, unity has made great progress in many countries. Communists and Socialists are now united in a single trade union movement in France, Spain, Poland, Germany, Austria, Italy, the United States, India, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Chile and the Argentine. The Socialist and Communist Parties work regularly together in France, Spain, Belgium, Italy and Austria. In Germany they collaborate in the German Freedom Party. In India communists work with the Congress Socialist Party. Even in Iceland there is harmonious collaboration. Catalonia has seen the fusion of the two parties with a consequent rise in membership from 6,000 to 64,000. Fusion is imminent in all Spain and possibly in France. But the General Council maintains the opinion that Socialists and Communists cannot work together! It refuses to sanction international unity.

Out-generalled by the capitalists on the economic front, guilty of the gravest errors and most shameful inactivity on Spain, obstinately refusing unity with the Communists in spite of all examples that such unity invigorates the working class, such a year's record of the Citrine-Bevin policy has not helped Labour to advance its influence in the country.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 25 recent by-elections Labour's vote in 1936-7 fell to 351,657 compared with 381,162 in 1929, a drop of 8 per cent. It is no excuse to say that the National Government's vote fell by a greater amount, for that is surely a reason why Labour should gain. This drop contrasts with the L.C.C. election result, where with the energetic aid of the Communists the Labour vote rose from 341,390 in 1934 to 446,116 in 1937. The Parliamentary figures mean quite simply that Labour is not advancing towards a majority at the next election. This has been recognised by Mr. Marchbank, of the N.U.R., who has raised the alarm, but drawn no conclusions.

The conclusion is simple and inescapable. The Citrine-Bevin policy of doing nothing to offend the government neither gains economic successes for the working class nor encourages the electorate to vote Labour.

After such a year of opportunities wasted, while the sands are speedily running out, what arguments are being advanced for the continuation of the present policy with its dismal record of failure ?

Here are a number of typical expressions by the leading group.

The Editor of the *Daily Herald*, replying on July 10 to Gallacher's article on the execution of the 8 generals :

> The Russian dictatorship, like other dictatorships before it, is methodically and cruelly removing all who would oppose or challenge a personal despotism.

Arthur Greenwood on unity :

> I know that enthusiasms run away with people but I want to harnass inside the bigger movement . . . . all the enthusiasm we have got and not seek alliances with forces which for years have been stabbing us in the back. (March 1, 1937.)

Marchbank at the N.U.R. Conference debate on unity :

> There was any amount of evidence for the suggestions as to interference by these people with the business of trade union organisations and as to the methods adopted for undermining the position of officially elected representatives . . . .
>
> There was the National Unity Campaign Committee ; they had had splendid meetings, these kind of circus turns were always well supported, it was the sort of method Mosley adopted to get his crowd. (*Railway Review*, July 16.)

Bevin's organ, the *Record*, on unofficial movements :

> Unofficial bodies are unnecessary ; their very existence creates a feeling in the minds of the members that officers and committeemen are incompetent or cannot be trusted. . . . In an atmosphere poisoned by suspicion, the confidence of members in their own elected representatives is destroyed and in the end members lose confidence in themselves. (July, 1937.)

Citrine, on disruption in the Labour Movement :

> The new technique is the tactic of a political party, pursued with great determination and with constantly varied expedients to capture

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> the Labour movement. Within the trade unions its method is to usurp the power of the democratically elected Executives by fomenting unofficial strike action whenever the opportunity presents itself.
> (*Labour*, July, 1937.)

and to put it in a nutshell, Citrine at the Warsaw session of the I.F.T.U. on July 10:

> I decline to have the British Labour movement drawn into contact with movements which under the guise of democracy, plot at the destruction of that democracy. Because Communists are anti-fascist, it does not mean that they are democratic.

Such statements show that these leaders believe that the Communists instigate industrial unrest, seek the disruption of the Labour Movement and of democracy so as to impose a Communist dictatorship. The Communists therefore are as great a danger as fascism. This conception has really become a fixed idea with these leaders.

It has become such an article of faith that they no longer even pretend to bring forward evidence for it, and they ignore all the facts, including evidence from their own colleagues of long standing, which point the other way. The Webbs can record the democratic development of the U.S.S.R.; Léon Jouhaux works for two years with Communist leaders without even a word suggesting disharmony; the united front raises the membership of the French Socialist Party from 80,000 to 180,000 and the trade unions from 900,000 to 5,000,000; De Brouckère, Adler, even Vandervelde can plead for unity; but Transport House remains blind and deaf. Communists and Socialists of all countries fight and die in Spain side by side in the International Brigade; Transport House has no information. Arthur Horner, Communist, is president of the South Wales Miners Federation and leads its revival; the Tolpuddle silver cup, supreme award, will be presented at this year's Congress to a branch secretary whose 1,126 new members were made resulting from organising work led by Communists; Transport House repeats its formula "Communism is disruption."

This fixed idea leads Citrine into attitudes bordering on absurdity. He poses in the I.F.T.U. as the defender of British Labour from destructive contact with Communism. He says this before trade union chiefs who in alliance with the Communists have won the 40-hour week and holidays with pay, and are working to aid Spain, and who cannot fail to observe that under the virgin purity of Citrine's leadership British Labour has done none of these things. Since Citrine has been secretary of the General Council not one single major industrial or political success has been won by Labour. Surely a general with a 12 years record of unvarying defeat should be a little more careful in adopting the heroic pose of saviour.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This fixed idea establishes a blockade of all unwelcome facts. It leads to the practical consequences of last year which we have enumerated above and which can be summarised as non-intervention by official Labour in the class struggle. They left Spain to fight alone, they left the London busmen to fight alone, they left every strike or wages movement isolated, for in Citrine's mind strikes are the creation of Communists. Just as non-intervention in Spain meant freedom for fascism to bring its forces to bear against Spanish democracy so non-intervention in the strikes at home means freedom for the capitalists to bring their forces into action against the workers.

Whence does this fixed idea draw its strength? Unless its roots are found and removed it will persist. Consider the remark of Marchbank during the short term programme debate at the N.U.R. conference:

> If they made the same progress during the next 30 years as they had made during the past 30 years, then he had no fear but that they would achieve the goal of the Socialist Commonwealth. (*Railway Review*, July 16.)

The idea that we can look forward to another 30 years of development comparable to the last 30 years shows complete failure to understand the period we live in. The changes in class relations, produced by the fact that capitalism has passed its zenith of expansion and entered its decline, are not apparent to Marchbank. In a world where Hitler's headsman executes former social democratic trade union officials, with Madrid under fascist shell fire, the prospect of 30 years peaceful Labour advance is seriously held out!

The tragedy is that Marchbank here expresses what is in the mind of large numbers of trade unionists who, having seen other crises pass, vaguely hope to see this one pass also. Indeed, what other conception can be in the minds of those who have been deprived by reformist leadership of the searchlight of Marxist science which alone can help them to see the realities of the world of class relations? We have a tremendous amount to do yet, and to do urgently, in making understood in the organised movement that, compared with the period of its growth, the political environment has undergone a complete change. Creatures which cannot adapt themselves to their environment perish. They may be as big as the brontosaurus but size will not save them. The present Labour Movement is in danger of perishing like the German movement, precisely because its leaders, steeped in the old reformism, fail to react to the changes which have taken place in capitalism.

Marchbank only repeats what Citrine has formulated more politically on many occasions. When Citrine launched his attack on the Minority Movement in December, 1927, he wrote:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> I believe that clear thinking, along with a clear view of the evolution of trade unionism, of the motives that animate it, and of the methods which it has used, will suffice to show that the lines of its future development run in the direction of making the workers' organisations an integral part of the economic machinery of society.

Here we have the same refusal to understand the class struggle and political reality.

Ignoring the realities of the class struggle, the Citrine-Bevin leadership, instead of rousing the strength of the masses, appeal to the government. The appeal implies there is much common ground between the government and Labour. To express completely his thought at Warsaw, Citrine should have said "the Communists are against democracy, Labour and the National Government are for it." Transport House on all major political issues last year was with the National Government against the Communists. But to seek the government's friendship involves keeping the masses quiet. Hence the frantic fear of Communism, for Communism means rousing the masses to movement. So measures are taken to drive out Communism, at the risk of splitting the movement. That is the policy of recent years which Congress will be asked to endorse once more.

The salvation of the trade unions demands an energetic struggle, on grounds both of principle and expediency, against this policy. It is leading to material defeat and moral bankruptcy, as it did in Germany. From a defeat in battle a movement can learn and rise again rapidly, from constant surrender without battle comes apathy and despair. The speeches of Citrine and Bevin already show the technique of destroying militancy, Socialist principle, and class solidarity. Read again their words at Plymouth last year on Spain, words carefully calculated to rouse the worst feelings—hesitancy, fear, selfishness, expediency, cowardice. No confidence in the working class, no hatred of tyranny, no flame of solidarity. It was not by such speeches that the trade unions were built.

Challenge to the Citrine-Bevin policy grows steadily. The trade union members do not want to share the fate of German Labour, neither do they desire that the outward form of the movement be kept intact by a shameful surrender of principles and material gains. A serious demand is rising for a policy, based on the realities of the class struggle, which will revitalise the movement and enable British Labour to do its duty to democracy and the international movement and to march forward to socialism in this generation. This demand has shown itself in the enthusiastic thousands at meetings of the Unity Campaign, in the hundreds of thousands who have taken part in street actions against Mosley, in the rising votes for unity among distributive workers, miners, engineers, builders and railwaymen, in the united efforts to send medical aid to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spain and to support the International Brigade, the movement of constituency Labour Parties, the extending circles of thought and discussion around the Left Book Club, the ceaseless spread of the *Daily Worker* among the basic sections of the working class.

Events will deepen this movement. The Arms decision will cause large numbers not only to work for its reversal but to consider how it could come about. They will be disposed to join forces with the Left. The rising cost of living will intensify the wages movement. The employers demand for labour and for uninterrupted production will facilitate the growth of the shop stewards movement within the unions. While the dangers facing the working class rise rapidly, the forces that can defeat them are also rising. The ground lost can be rapidly regained, but only by a rapid change of policy. Defeatism in high places must be replaced by the policy of determined battle against reaction.

Within Congress a vigorous expression of this growing challenge will hearten the whole movement, can reverse the Arms decision, can commence the mass campaign for Spain, can firmly repulse any proposals for discrimination and disciplinary action against Communists and militants, and can direct the General Council on the road towards establishing unity.

Unity is the key, for the unity of Labour and Communism means that the organised masses take up the class struggle against capital and reaction. To split the ranks by the exclusion or penalising of Communists means to submit to the demands of the employers. The London bus strike showed that all the talk about Communist intrigues and plots was nothing but a cover for sacrificing trade union interests to the employers. To exclude, gag or remove from office those who voice the demand for a change of policy is to wipe out democracy in the trade unions, and that means stopping the flow of its life blood.

Congress delegates have a great opportunity. The Citrine-Bevin group are compromised by their mistake on Spain. On the Arms issue there is not unanimity in the General Council. A fearless statement, from the floor of Congress, of a class policy for the trade union movement in the coming year will have far reaching results.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ABDICATION OF THE LABOUR PARTY

By JOHN STRACHEY

THE gravest fact of the contemporary situation is the almost complete disappearance of the Labour Party as an effective force in British political life. If the matter were not so grave, one might be disposed to suggest that somebody at Transport House should put up a notice: "Lost, Well-Known Political Party. Last seen wandering in the City of Westminster, with a confused look on its face, neatly dressed in a dark blue suit, bowler hat and white spats."

But one has hardly the heart to joke about the business. A renewed and extreme impotence has overcome the Labour Party both in and outside parliament as a result, above all, of the abstention of the parliamentary party on the armaments vote. It has come at a time when there were some signs of the beginnings of recovery in the fighting power of the British Labour movement. At long last the support of the Spanish neutrality pact had been abandoned. The National Council of Labour, though it called not a single meeting on the matter, had even gone so far as to issue a public statement that there was a danger of the British Government recognising Franco. But these beginnings of an opposition to the world policy of the National Government have been unfortunately cancelled by the surrender on the armaments vote.

The abstention on the armaments vote was, of course, the logical result of the confused compromise on the question of rearmament which the Labour Party Conference at Edinburgh passed nearly a year ago. It may be worth while to reprint the text of the resolution which the Labour Party then adopted. It reads as follows:

> That in view of the threatening attitude of the Dictatorships which are increasing their armaments at an unprecedented rate, flouting International Law, and refusing to co-operate in the work of organising Peace, this Conference declares that the armed strength of the countries loyal to the League of Nations must be conditioned by the armed strength of the potential aggressors.
>
> The Conference, therefore, reaffirms the policy of the Labour Party to maintain such defence forces as are consistent with our country's responsibility as a Member of the League of Nations, the preservation of the people's rights and liberties, the continuance of democratic institutions, and the observance of International Law.
>
> Realising the relationship between foreign policy and armaments, and having regard to the deplorable record of the Government, the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Labour Party declines to accept responsibility for a purely competitive armament policy. It reserves full liberty to criticise the rearmament programme of the present Government, and declares the continuance of vested interests in the private manufacture of arms to be a grave contributory danger to the Peace of the World.
>
> The Conference accordingly pledges the Labour Party to unceasing efforts, both by exposing the present Government's record of incompetence and betrayal of its Peace pledges and by expounding our own positive International Policy, to secure the return of a Labour Government to power.

This resolution, both at the Edinburgh Conference and ever since, defied interpretation. At the Conference, as everyone who attended it, or read the report, will remember, the dominant figures of the movement were themselves found to be in disagreement as to what the resolution meant. Dr. Dalton, in moving it, made it clear that he meant it to mean that the Labour Party was henceforward to support the Government's rearmament programme. Mr. Morrison, on the contrary, made it clear that in his view the resolution meant that the armaments programme was to be opposed. Mr. Bevin, following him, virtually accused Mr. Morrison of bad faith in this interpretation.

In a sense the result has been almost worse than if either policy had been adopted. For a whole year it has been plain to the country that the Labour movement simply did not know where it stood on the matter of rearmament. The damage which this has done to the Labour movement is enormous ; it is one of the factors most responsible for the tragic decline of the Labour vote at recent by-elections. The culmination of this inability to adopt any line is signified by the abstention on the armament vote. Here in parliament itself the Labour Party declared that it did not even pretend to have a policy of its own on the greatest public question of the day. This was political abdication and has been so interpreted.

The deepest meaning of this act of abdication was that the Labour Party did not even desire to defeat the National Government and to come into office ; that it felt itself profoundly incapable to cope with a world situation which it did not understand. The abdication of the opposition has inevitably given the National Government a free hand to develop its characteristic world policy. Its first fruits have been that rapid *rapprochement* between the National Government and Fascist Italy which was begun by the exchange of letters between Chamberlain and Mussolini.

The controversy within the parliamentary Labour Party on the question of whether or not to vote against rearmament was conducted on a basis of extreme confusion as to the real intentions of the National Government. Those Labour members, led by Dr. Dalton, who secured the abstention

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Party, did so on the basis of declarations of militant anti-fascism. The underlying assumption on which they worked and argued was that the National Government's world policy was anti-fascist and that, therefore, its efforts to strengthen itself must not be opposed by the Labour movement. But many of the opponents of this line suffered equally from the same error. For the main opponents, within the parliamentary Labour Party, to abstention, or voting for rearmament, were the Pacifists ; *and they too assumed that the National Government's policy was anti-fascist.* But for that very reason they wished to oppose it because they considered that an anti-fascist policy on the part of the British Government would produce war. Thus both sides in the controversy were completely at sea, for both started out from a wholely erroneous but, by them, unquestioned assumption, namely, that the policy of the National Government was to oppose the Fascist powers.

At first sight it seems almost impossible to understand how the parliamentary Party can have allowed itself to adopt, and still more to preserve, after Manchuria, Abyssinia and non-intervention in Spain, this astonishing hypothesis that the National Government's line is genuinely anti-fascist. This, of course, is the assumption which took the Labour Party to defeat in 1935. It is extremely instructive to re-read to-day the speeches made by the leaders of the movement just two years ago when the question at issue was that of opposing the imminent Italian occupation of Abyssinia. Both Sir Walter Citrine and Dr. Dalton, for example, were extremely strong and firm at that time and on this issue. They scourged the pacifist elements in the movement, who dared to suggest that we ought not to apply sanctions to Mussolini because this might involve war. Sir Walter Citrine, at the 1935 Trades Union Congress, said :

> The irrefutable facts are : Italy has accepted the covenant ; Italy has denounced, in effect, war ; Italy is preparing for war ; Italy is attacking a defenceless nation. We must act. We must do something to restrain the bully. There is only one way of dealing with a bully, and that is by the use of force. . . . . Some of you, I know, think this is a very serious matter. I agree with you. I overheard a delegate say at the commencement of my speech, " It means war." It may mean war, but that is the thing we have to face. (*Trades Union Congress Report*, 1935, p. 349.)

Dr. Dalton, at the 1935 Labour Party Conference, was equally emphatic :

> A threat of sanctions may be enough to prevent war. If not, the actual use of sanctions, economic and financial, without any military or naval action, may be sufficient to re-establish peace even if Mussolini breaks it.
>
> If not—face all the facts—it is hard even now to believe it, but if Mussolini be so lunatic as to resist the united League of Nations by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> force, then so be it. He will order the firing of the first shot, and he will take the consequences of that order.

It is profoundly instructive to contrast this vigour, correct in itself, with the peace at any price policy which they adopted in 1936 on the question of Spain. For a whole year they cajoled and, one is bound to say, tricked the movement into supporting unconditional non-intervention in Spain by the argument that any opposition to Fascist aggression would mean war. In a word, they adopted in 1936 exactly the line of policy which they had so berated in 1935.

How are we to account for this extraordinary change? I do not think that there is any doubt about the matter. In 1935 our leaders believed sincerely, though mistakenly, that the National Government intended to oppose Italy's aggression in Abyssinia. Accordingly they felt that there was no danger in themselves vigorously opposing Italian aggression. But in 1936 they knew (for they were told so in a most unequivocal way) that the National Government was determined not to oppose Fascist aggression in Spain. Hence, they felt that it would be far too dangerous for them to do so. In a word the whole present policy of the British Labour movement is based, even, and indeed especially, on such vital issues as that of whether or not Fascist aggression is to be opposed, on the principle of supporting on essentials whatever is at the moment the line of the National Government.

The truth is that ever since 1933 our leaders have felt that any vigorous opposition to the National Government on essentials must be avoided at all costs, lest it drive the British ruling class down the Fascist road. It is this mood, partly conscious and partly unconscious, which accounts for the determined blindness of the whole of the parliamentary Labour Party to the nature of the present world policy of the National Government. There are none so blind as those who won't see, and the leaders of the Labour Party simply will not see that the world policy of the National Government, for which all its armaments are being prepared, is not one of opposition to the Fascist aggressors. And they will not see this because it would be inexpressibly painful for them to realise this fact. Their every political utterance and action has been based, since 1933, on the supposed possibility of opposing the world offensive of Fascism and at the same time abstaining from doing anything which would bring them into serious conflict with the will of the National Government. But the possibility of doing this wholly depends upon the assumption that the policy of the National Government is itself to oppose the Fascist aggressors. Nothing, not even the evidence, now piled mountain high, of the collaboration of the British Government in each successive act of Fascist aggression, will shake their determination to pretend themselves and to the world that the National Government is an anti-fascist force, which ought therefore to be assisted to arm.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moreover, there are, of course, many superficial facts which help our leaders to believe in the anti-fascist character of the National Government. It is true that the clash between British imperialism on the one hand, and German and Italian imperialism on the other, is real and acute. The National Government's world policy is two-sided. It cannot be unequivocally and wholly pro-fascist. Its imperialist interests forbid this. It has to proceed by attempting to divert control and delay Fascist acts of aggression; to turn them on to parts of the world where it believes British interests are not involved or, at any rate, are not so directly involved, etc., etc. If, therefore, it is absolutely necessary to your peace of mind, to your whole political position, to believe that the National Government is an anti-fascist force, you can pretend that each act of connivance at Fascist aggression, each refusal to join in the united opposition of the democracies, each betrayal of the League of Nations and collective security, is merely a sign of the " weakness, muddle and vacillation " of the National Government.

It is, of course, delightful for the leaders of the parliamentary Labour Party to adopt this view. How incomparably comfortable it is for them to suppose that they and Mr. Eden and Mr. Chamberlain all really agree as to what ought to be done. Only, of course, they feel and assert they would do it all much more bravely and firmly. The hard truth is, however, that there is nothing weak or muddled about the foreign policy of the National Government. It is a subtle and difficult policy. There are profound and insoluble contradictions between the class interests and the imperial interests of the British governing class. But granted their situation, Eden and Chamberlain manœuvre with hereditary skill.

The proper policy of the parliamentary Labour Party was, of course, to vote against the rearmament programme of the National Government, not from pacifist reasons and on the assumption that the National Government was opposing Fascist aggression, but for anti-fascist reasons and on the assumption that the National Government was not opposing Fascist aggression. Only those members of the parliamentary Labour Party who support the unity of the movement seem even to have heard of such an attitude. Those who have heard of it (with the same exceptions) reject it immediately as impossible to convey to the public. I believe that this is a profound delusion. The first is that the members of the Labour Party who would have to put over this line to the public do not themselves understand it. And it is perfectly true, of course, that it is very difficult to make people understand something which you have not grasped yourself. It is an appalling fact, but it is a fact, that only that handful of members of the parliamentary Labour Party who have advocated unity have even conceived of opposition to the policy of the National Government from anything but what is, at bottom, a pacifist standpoint.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For the parliamentary Party the choice has evidently seemed to be between absolute pacifism of the religious type and support of the National Government either on the hypothesis that it is an anti-fascist force or out of simple nationalism. It is not that the Labour members rejected the alternative of opposition on the basis of the struggle of the working class striving to save the world from facsism and war. It was that they simply had not conceived of the very possibility of such an attitude.

The second factor which lends colour to the idea that it would be difficult to explain a vote against rearmament taken on an anti-fascist basis is, of course, the fact that the Labour Party has failed during the past six years to expose the pro-Fascist character of the National Government's world policy. They could not even begin to expose it because they could not bear to believe themselves that the National Government was pro-Fascist. They did, of course, criticise each successive betrayal by the National Government of the League, the collective system and the cause of peace. They did criticise connivance at the Japanese invasion of Manchuria and the successive Italian invasions of Abyssinia and Spain. But, once again, they did so on the basis that the National Government's intentions were all right, but that it had simply been weak, muddled and ineffective in carrying out what were fundamentally correct intentions. Naturally, if for six years you have taught the public to believe this, it does become difficult to vote against this supposedly weak but well-intentioned government increasing its armed forces and so becoming stronger. You do then open yourself to the charge that you are simultaneously advocating a stronger foreign policy and a weaker means for carrying it out.

How totally different the position would be if, ever since 1931, the Labour Party had first itself faced the fact of the basically pro-fascist nature of the National Government's policy, and secondly, had forced the country to face this fact. By now, after six years of sustained agitation and education on these lines, there would have been no difficulty in making the whole working class and progressive forces of the country see that it was vitally necessary to oppose vast new armaments being put into the hands of such a government as this, But, if the Labour movement had, during the past six years, been doing this, the National Government would not now be in existence. The last election would have been won instead of lost, and Britain would be under a government which would have ranged her solidly with the progressive forces of the world ; the Italian and German invasions of Spain would have been an impossibility. In a word, the world would have been a totally different place.

But it is not, even now, too late to convince public opinion of the necessity of opposing the Government's rearmament programme. On the contrary, if only the movement itself could reach understanding and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clarity on this matter, it would soon begin to convince the public. Is it too much to hope that the frightful consequences of the abdication of opposition represented by abstention on the armament votes will shock the movement into full realisation of what is happening? William Rust described in these pages last month how admissions of how appalling is the situation of the Labour movement are now being made by our national leaders. Cannot, if not they, then their supporters, realise that if they wish to have any movement left to lead, or to participate in, it is indispensable that there should be no more capitulations to the National Government? Cannot they see that, even if they believe that opposition to the armaments estimates would be misunderstood, nothing would do the movement one-tenth of the harm which its present impotence before the National Government is doing it? Cannot they see that nothing can kill a Labour movement except a failure to offer some practical, alternative leadership to the community to that offered by the ruling class? Cannot they see that such a failure not only can, but must inevitably, kill a Labour movement, and that it is now actually doing so? It may be this tacit support of the Government's rearmament programme will be the most important question at the forthcoming Labour Party Conference.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHINA—THE SECOND PHASE

By RICHARD GOODMAN

WHEN, thanks to the barefaced connivance of the British National Government and the disunity of the Chinese people, Japan seized Manchuria, it was obvious that her aggression would not end there but would be followed by an attack on the five Northern Provinces, Hopei, Chahar, Suiyuan, Shansi and Shantung.

Manchuria represented the first phase in the adventure of Japanese imperialism, having as its object the establishment of a military and economic base from which the attack on China proper could be launched. The present hostilities are an indication that Japanese imperialism has entered upon the second phase of its aggressive adventure against China and the Chinese people.

The annexation of North China, whatever the political form this annexation assumed, was placed on the order of the day immediately Manchuria was attacked. For, economically and strategically, the five Northern provinces and Manchuria are complementary.

In the first place, with a population of 90 odd million North China represents a tremendous market for Japanese industry. A Japanese monopoly of North China's import trade—valued at approximately 200 million dollars annually—would be of tremendous assistance to Japanese capitalism in its tariff war with its rivals. Moreover the split between Manchuria and North China has seriously affected Manchurian economy and deprived it, relatively undeveloped though it is, of its natural market. If, therefore, Japanese-controlled industry in Manchuria is to be revived and developed—and on this Japanese capital insists—this "natural" market must be restored to Manchuria.

Again, these five provinces are rich in those raw materials—iron, oil, copper, tin and gold—which are essential to Japan in a major war, as well as being, potentially, the means by which the Japanese textile industry —which, at the present time, is forced to import more than 400 million yen's worth of cotton from the United States and India—can become independent. Finally the five provinces are great cattle-rearing country and, once under Japanese control, would go a long way towards remedying Japan's lack of butter, hides and other cattle products.

In the second place, North China is strategically of the greatest importance to the aggressive designs of Japanese imperialism. The two key points on the two most important railway lines linking North and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

South China are situated in Hopei, while the Peiping-Suiyuan line is the key line to North West China and the Mongolian People's Republic. Furthermore, control of the North China coast line with the ports of Chefoo, Weiheiwei and Tsingtao is essential if Japan, in a war with the Soviet Union, America or Britain, is to avoid the danger of a blockade and control of the coast line means control of the hinterland as well. Lastly, North China is the centre from which a drive can be launched both to the South, to Central Asia and against the Soviet Union.

The preparations made by the Japanese militarists to seize North China have been extremely thorough, much more so, in fact, than those which preceded the 1931 attack. These preparations have all been directed to the same end—to split the five provinces away from the Central Nanking government and to establish an "autonomous" régime which would be as much under Japanese control as is the puppet state of Manchukuo. These preparations too have all been along the now classical lines by which Japanese imperialism seeks to advance its interests. Take, for example, the chain of events provoked by Japan which led up to the formation of the Japanese-controlled Hopei-Chahar Political Council.

The whole affair began, of course, with an "incident"—this time in Tientsin itself, in May, 1935. Immediately, the Chief of Staff of the Japanese Kwantung army—Japanese army on the mainland—demanded that the Hopei Governor be dismissed, that the Hopei organisation of the Kuomintang and all other patriot Chinese organisations be suppressed and, finally, that the 100,000 former Manchurian troops stationed in Hopei should be withdrawn.

To these demands, Nanking, more concerned with suppressing the "red bandits" than with defending the territorial integrity of China, capitulated and, in so doing, encouraged Japan to ask for more, which it did immediately, demanding the liquidation of the Peiping Political Council, the suppression of the Blueshirt organisation in Hopei and the withdrawal of all Central Government troops from the province. Again Nanking gave in and again Japan took the offensive, occupying parts of Chahar and replacing Sung Che-yuan, governor of the province.

Then, in September, General Tada, commander of the Japanese forces in China, came out openly with the demand for the establishment of an "autonomous" régime and on October 13-16 a conference to plan the final steps was held. Present at this meeting were Major-General Okamura, director of the Second Department of the Jap General Staff, Tada and his second-in-command, the Military Attaché at Shanghai, General Hanshofer—former German Military Attaché at Tokyo and liaison officer between the Jap and Nazi General staff, and the President of the South Manchurian Railway, Matsuoka.

Plan elaborated at this gathering was as follows: the new régime—to be known as the North China Anti-Communist autonomous Council of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Chinese Republic—was to be governed by a political council, with provincial governments as usual. The political council was to operate from Peiping and would retain all government and tax revenues so as to be independent of Nanking. Japanese key men were to act as " advisors " and a special committee was to be set up to deal with the " red menace."

The plan, dated for operation at the end of November, required, however,

(1) a mass movement demanding autonomy ; and

(2) a sufficiently powerful Chinese general to head that movement.

The Japanese, however, try as they might, could discover neither. While it is true that some Chinese peasants, egged on by Jap agents, demonstrated against Nanking, these demonstrations were by no means pro-Japanese and the Jap military authorities had to withdraw, when the movement developed too far, and allow the Central government to deal with the situation.

The Japanese succeeded no better in their efforts to discover a Chinese general willing to play the role of their puppet. True they tried hard to nobble Sung Che-yuan, ex-governor of Chahar, and his successor Sian Chen-yin, but in the middle of the negotiations Sung received a telegram from Nanking ordering him to break of the talk and, to the amazement of the Japanese, obeyed.

Left, therefore, with the task of making the best of a bad job the Japanese ordered their agent Yin Ju-Keng to declare the " independence " of the twenty-seven north-eastern Hopei districts and sent their troops to occupy the railways of North Hopei. There followed negotiations between the Japanese authorities and the Nanking War Minister, which resulted in Nanking recognising the " autonomous " Hopei-Chahar political council established a little later with Sung Che-yuan as chairman and a corps of Japanese as " advisors."

It was obvious, nevertheless, that Japan would not long rest content with this position and since that time has in fact prepared consistently to make up for her 1935 failure. Last year, for example, the provocative attack by mixed Mongol-Manchurian on Suiyuan was undoubtedly calculated to set the ball rolling again. But the heroic and unexpected defence of Suiyuan surprised Japan and demonstrated very clearly not only that a tremendous patriotic anti-Japanese feeling had developed throughout the whole of China, but that so strong was this feeling that not even Nanking could ignore it. Suiyuan showed also that the annexation of North China would not be achieved without military operations on a much larger scale than had ever before been necessary.

This year Nanking, in preparation for the forthcoming National Assembly, has been paying more attention than usual to the Northern Provinces. Extensive preparations for the elections to the Assembly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been made while the Nanking Minister for the Interior has personally visited these regions. The Japanese authorities and agents have attempted to counter this move on the part of Nanking to strengthen its influence by a campaign of incitement against the Central Government representatives and by raising more forcibly than ever the issue of the " independence " and autonomy of North China. The fact that this Tokyo-inspired campaign did not gain support angered the Japanese and was a factor contributing to the resort to military action.

A careful estimation of the international situation at the beginning of this summer persuaded Japan that now would be an excellent opportunity to remedy her 1935 failure. To delay would, in the light of certain developments, be dangerous. What were the factors in this situation as estimated by the Japanese General Staff ?

In the first place, Britain and France were again deeply involved in Europe : while in 1931 they were preoccupied with the effects of the newly-broken world economic crisis, to-day they were preoccupied with the crisis precipitated by the fascist invasion in Spain.

In the second place, through the policy of " non-intervention " Britain had demonstrated to the aggressors of the whole world her determination not to stand in their way.

In the third place, Japan's position was strengthened as against both the Soviet Union on the one hand and against her main imperialist rivals in China on the other by the existence of the so-called Anti-Communist Pact with Germany and its secret military clauses.

In the fourth place, it is known that both Germany and Italy had intimated that they would welcome a " diversion " in Asia.

In the fifth place, the friendliest of relations with Britain—who had agreed to conversations to discuss spheres of influence in China—obtained.

Finally, the British National Government, in steam-rollering the proposal for a Pacific pact on non-aggression and mutual assistance made by the Australian delegate at the Imperial Conference, had shown exactly where she stood so far as Pacific affairs were concerned and had thereby underlined her opposition to co-operation with the U.S.A. in this part of the world.

Against these factors favouring action, a number of unfavourable factors had to be considered.

In the first place, the position of the U.S.S.R. had been strengthened considerably and was growing stronger from day to day. It would be the most serious error to imagine, as some have done, that the Japanese General Staff had any illusions about the position in the U.S.S.R. and in the Red Army in particular. Indeed a prominent Japanese General has stated quite openly that, far from weakening the Red Army, the exposure and execution of Tuchachevsky and his co-traitors had actually

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strengthened it considerably. Nor was there any indication whatsoever that, interested as the U.S.S.R. was in the Spanish crisis, this would mean a weakening of her vigilance or would decrease her ability to stand firm in defence of her interests wherever they might be threatened. The Japanese provocations on the Amur river to which the Soviet Union replied so firmly and yet in a manner so surely consistent with her aim to preserve peace, were partly designed by Japan to test U.S.S.R. The result of that test was indeed a disappointment for the Tokio adventures.

In the second place, the U.S.A. was not preoccupied with the Spanish crisis and anti-Japanese feeling, as a result of the Alaska salmon fishing incidents, was widespread.

Finally, since 1931, and especially during the last year, the suicidal disunity of the Chinese people, thanks mainly to the work of the Chinese Communist Party, the Chinese Soviet Government and the Chinese Red Army, now nearing a million strong, was gradually being overcome and might well find some measure of completion before the year's end.

Thus, taking all these factors together, Japan estimated that the situation was favourable for a new advance, while delay would only serve to strengthen the forces which stood in opposition. Consequently the Kwantung army launched its attack.

In addition the development of the internal economic and political situation in Japan also convinced the military fascist clique, the big bourgeoisie and landowners of the desirability of some new " incident " which would divert attention into less dangerous and, at the same time, more profitable, directions.

During the past year a very wide opposition to the military-fascist clique had grown rapidly finding expression not only in the open hostility of the Diet to the huge military expenditure provided for in the budget, but in the open and growing opposition to the adventurist foreign policy of this clique, the popular struggle against the fascination of the state apparatus (ranging from the Nihon Musanto [Proletarian Party] to members of the bourgeois Minseito and Seiyukai) and the big gains of Labour in the two general elections (*e.g.*, Osaka). Along with this a wave of strikes has been sweeping the country affecting, in particular the textile industry and the transport services in the big towns.

To split this rising tide of opposition, the military-fascist clique employs a number of methods varying from open terror to demagogy (the new " moderation " of Japanese foreign policy detected by some observers on the formation of the present cabinet). And they calculate, no doubt, on a repetition of the position taken up by the leadership of the Seikai Taisuto (Social Democratic Party) during the Manchurian operations when these so-called Socialists supported war. Nevertheless can there be any doubt that the Japanese militarists anticipate a widespread

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opposition to their latest adventure. (The police have warned organisations of both the Nihon Musanto and the Seikai Taisuto not to " foment " strikes, or lead demonstrations against the War.)

In this respect the stand taken by Nihon Musanto against anything but peaceful negotiations between Japan and China—an attitude expressed very clearly in its recent manifesto—should not be underestimated. The existence of this legal party openly opposed to war represents a new factor in the situation compared to that in 1931.

If the development of the internal position in Japan is of importance, then the development of the Chinese people towards that unity they lacked in 1931, a development which has been particularly rapid since the Sianfu " incident," may well prove decisive.

The patient efforts of the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Soviet Government directed towards unifying the great Chinese nation for a mighty final struggle against Japanese imperialism are, it would appear, at last bearing fruit. Of first class significance in this respect was the attitude adopted by the Communist Party and the Red Army during the Sianfu crisis. The " kidnapping " of Chiang Kai-Shek by Chang Hseuh-liang and the Shensi Pacification Officer Yang Hu-chen turned the eyes of the whole country on to Sianfu. Over the border, within easy striking distance was the Red Army. No one can doubt that had the Red Army chosen it could have swept through Shensi, increasing its strength by many thousands. But that, as the Chinese Communists saw only too well, would have meant civil war and would have provided Japan with an unparalleled opportunity for attack. But instead of acting in a partisan spirit, the Chinese Communists and the Red Army, who disapproved the precipitate methods of Chang Hseuh-liang, played a major role in securing the release of the Generalissimo, and therefore, in averting the civil war which the pro-Japanese elements in Nanking did their best to bring about.

All these things were seen and understood by the Chinese people who realised that the Chinese Communists were far more sincere patriots than certain of their leaders in Nanking.

Since Sianfu tremendous strides towards greater unity have been made until to-day, Chou En-lai, Vice-Chairman of the Red Army Military Council, is actually in Nanking working on with the Central Government General Staff details for the co-operation and unification of the Red and Nanking Armies.

The significance of such co-operation can hardly be exaggerated. The Red Army, according to latest figures, comprises to-day nearly a million soldiers. Its morale and fighting ability are by now legendary. Against a united people's National Revolutionary Anti-Japanese Army, formed of Nanking troops and the Red Army, the Japanese militarists may well break their heads.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The possibility that some sort of corresponding political agreement between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party on the basis of Sun Yat-sen's three principles may be realised sooner than expected—possibly during the forthcoming National Assembly—is now generally admitted. If this takes place Japan will find herself faced for the first time by a China united both politically and militarily, determined not only to stem, blow for blow, the new aggression, but to win back from the invader the lost provinces of Hopei and Chahar and the whole of Manchuria.

Thus, in embarking on this, her second stage of her programme of conquest, Japan may well discover that she has bitten off more than she can stomach, and retire severely whipped from the Continent. But she will do so only after a long war, a war which may well involve the other powers with interests in the Pacific and Asia.

The duration of that war and the further deterioration of the international situation which such a war must effect depends, however, above everything else on the attitude of the British National Government and, therefore, on the attitude of the British people and their Labour Movement. It was Britain's betrayal of its pledges and of collective security in 1931 which made possible Mussolini's attack on Abyssinia and the joint fascist invasion of Spain. A similar betrayal to-day would inevitably have results a thousand times more terrible for peace. It is highly likely in fact that it would be the final death blow to the peace of the entire world.

BETTER THAN THIS!

Is it the holiday season? We have had only *one* donation to our Debt Fund this month in a welcome £1 from Julius First. Guarantees are slow, but make a fair show.

Let us start the Autumn well and have a bumper response next month.

GUARANTEE FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Previously acknowledged ..	19	17	8
D. J. Wallace	0	10	0
A. E. G. Hawkins	0	10	0
R. R. Rathbone	1	0	0
D. Meltzer	0	10	0
Onyx	1	0	0
	£23	7	8

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CATALONIA AND COMMUNISM

By JUAN COMORERA

[*The peculiar importance of Catalonia from the standpoint of the internal situation in Spain lends exceptional interest to this report by Juan Comorera to the recently-held first national conference of the United Socialist Party of Catalonia (P.S.U.C.), formed by the union of the Catalan Socialist and Communist Parties and affiliated to the Communist international.*]

1. The Transformation of Catalonia

A YEAR of the National War for Independence : a year of Popular Revolution : a year of vital experience for our youthful and already glorious Party. These three angles give the key to the first National Conference of the United Socialist Party of Catalonia. At the beginning of the war, Catalonia was an open field for the negative experiments of anarchism, and the unhappy futilities of certain demagogic influences. Without Marxist experience, without any strong Marxist trade union influence, Catalonia appeared in the midst of the Republic as a body without soul, subject to all the contradictions, disabilities and barren weaknesses, that flowered on this fertile soil.

In view of this it was necessary to build up a Marxist movement whose courage and emancipated energy would appeal to the intelligence of the widest possible circles. It had to be extensive and strong enough to halt the swift march towards decomposition, and create the backbone of a new Catalonia, free from the sentimental fog of demagogic republicanism and the childishness of traditional anarchy. To-day we are able to state : Catalonia is no longer a field where negative anarchism and the futile demagogic policy of certain republicans can grow unchecked. In one year of suffering and pseudo-revolution, Catalonia has by a magnificent effort brought about a Marxist movement. Catalonia has arrived at its true course, and follows it with a firm step towards the anti-Fascist victory, towards the revolutionary construction of a more just, progressive and happier world.

2. The Balance of the First Year

Before we speak of new tasks, we will have to strike the balance of the first year of war, revolution and the struggle for the consolidation of the Popular Front. Some anarchist comrades who are at odds with us affirm that in the international sphere our struggle is already lost. They

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

propose a disastrous policy that would leave us in complete isolation. The anarchist position is petit-bourgeois. The anarchists have reasoned thus: France, the country of the great Revolution, the originator of that glorious slogan, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," has shown her great traditions by not aiding us. This is also the trend of thought of the Left Republicans. The one and the other of them make a brave show of words. For them "heroic" literature plays the part of concrete realities. And if reality should not conform to this literature, the anarchists and republicans plunge into despair, and start out on some disastrous course of policy. Some even take the road that leads to inconsistent and rash conduct, give up the struggle, or accept with resignation a fate that they themselves fear.

(*a*) *Our International Policy*

We, on the other hand cannot consider the situation in this way, and we refuse to act in an hysterical manner. It is clear, from the ethical point of view, that the reaction at the front against the actions of the powerful democracies, can never be too energetic. But the international policy of capitalist countries, democratic as well as Fascist, is not determined by moral principles. International policy is not a thing of sentiment, but a cold calculation of interests. The international policy of the capitalists is the result of the relation of forces between the State and the classes. This is an elementary principle that the anarchists have not accepted, and the republicans do not understand. Our international political line has not deviated from this principle, and thus we have been able to supply at each moment the correct word and the right course.

To-day, signs of change can be observed in the international policy of the powerful democracies. This change has been assisted by the increase in sympathy of the whole world towards our cause, the beginning of an understanding between the Communist and Socialist Internationals which makes for joint action, and also the growing brutality of German and Italian Fascism. In England and France they are beginning to understand that Hitler and Mussolini, through the conquest of Spain, propose by encircling France, to divide between them a large part of British and French possessions. The small countries of the north, Czechoslovakia and central Europe, follow the progress of our struggle with deep anxiety. For they see that their own peace, independence, and territorial safety, may well be decided on Spanish soil. The bourgeois democracies see their national and fundamental interests in danger, and are looking for a change in position. This position depends on the balance of affairs, and the firmness with which we carry out our internal and war policies.

We should make a great mistake if we under-estimated this change in the international political situation. We have necessarily to consider

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

others. The isolation which certain anarchists advise would be nothing less than suicidal. We must continue on the same political line that our Party forged at the beginning of the war.

In the world of to-day, in the capitalist world, nothing is given free, and the loser can expect support from no one. We have to understand that there is only one U.S.S.R. in the world. The Soviet Union, fatherland of the world proletariat, is our only true friend. In all the world we can only be sure of the U.S.S.R. ; all the rest depends upon our international policy. On considering all the positive and negative factors of our struggle in the international sphere, we are in a position to state that we shall win here also.

(b) *The Conquests of the Popular Revolution*

There are people who have latterly accused us of counter-revolution, who have told us that the revolution is dead, and who say that the result will be a return to the situation as before the 19th of July. Is such a counter-revolution possible ?

There are naturally people—in the ranks of our allies as well—who dream of the past, and have not lost the illusion that the machine is capable of retrogression. But reality tells us something else. On this subject we can say to these people, clearly and decisively, that on the 19th of July something definitely died that can never be born again, that the return of land, houses and factories to the old owners and parasites is absolutely inconceivable. There can be no pretence that the dead will come to life again, because they will meet not only the P.S.U.C., the U.G.T. (the Socialist Union Centre), and the Farmers' Union, but also the great majority of all the anti-Fascist people of Catalonia, who would naturally see the hand of Fascism in an act of this nature. There are certain people who draw the false conclusion from the withdrawal of the C.N.T. (the Anarchist Union Centre) from the Government, that the intention of making affairs return to their old state will be realised. These latter have not understood that precisely at this moment the " uncontrollables " have no part in a government that is consolidating the revolution.

The origin of the war makes it a deep-rooted revolution. The war was provoked by the corrupt breed of Spaniard, the clergy, the large landowners, the aristocracy, upper bourgeoisie, and the generals. These classes sought to take vengeance on a free people who had beaten them on the 16th of February. Their own forces powerless to defeat the free people of Spain, they had to seek the aid of Hitler and Mussolini, and in exchange for their mercenaries, and to keep up their privileged traditions, sold the riches and independence of our country. Thus when in the streets of Barcelona and Madrid the military uprisings were destroyed,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the upper bourgeoisie, implicated in the military coup, had fled, the factories passed into the hands of the workers ; into the hands of the workers, and not into the hands of the working class. It is necessary to emphasise this difference, for it is of fundamental importance. The banks were placed under workers' control. The parasites and the landowners no longer existed, and the land had passed into the hands of the peasants. Rent, which had represented an enormous millstone around the necks of the peasants, had been suppressed in Catalonia. The old Army and Civil Guard, instrument of the privileged classes, have been disbanded and replaced by our glorious Popular Army. The Civil Guard has been replaced by a new police force composed of genuine workers, who have left the front-line trenches to become the terror of the " uncontrollables," the Trotskyists, the Fifth Column, the Fascists, and all who wish to convert the Republic into a gangster State.

Besides having in their hands the instruments of production, the workers find themselves holding the power of political and military rights. And if because of the war they have not yet been able to attain general well-being, we can affirm that the working class has already created the basic conditions of its future complete emancipation. The peasant has found economic liberty, and is able to enjoy the fruits of his labour, and has drawn closer his alliance with the proletariat.

(c) *The Working Class has made itself into a strong organisation of the Popular Front*

The working class in the course of this war has built up a strong anti-Fascist front. Almost all the Spanish workers in Government territory have found themselves organised in one of the two trade union bodies, the U.G.T. and the C.N.T. If trade unionism has overcome the division which reigned before, the effected political change among the workers of Catalonia is much more substantial. The proletariat has created in Catalonia the P.S.U.C., a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party. And this deep comprehensive change in the structure and orientation of the working class, determined by the war and revolution, has made the Communist Party of Spain into the leading party of the politically organised working class. The wide advances of this great party are so extraordinary that they cannot be compared with the progress of any other political party. Moreover, we can see to-day that we are arriving at the culmination of an historic process : the process of the political unity of the workers. That is to say, the formation of a single proletarian party, by the fusion of the Communist Party of Spain with the Spanish Workers' Socialist Party. We have the good fortune to have initiated the realisation of this policy in one year of our unification.

In the course of the first year of war and revolution, the unity of action of the Spanish people has been strengthened. Catalonia understands

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to-day that its lot is bound up with the rest of the people of Spain. These great strides represent the balance of a year of war for national independence, a year of popular revolution.

3. Our Political Line has Triumphed, and established the Conditions of Victory

Our political line "for the war and the interests of the working class" has triumphed, and has smashed the policy of those that desire artificially to separate the war and the revolution, and who pretend to impose upon this war the character of a pseudo-revolution. Our policy of anti-Fascist revolutionary order has triumphed, and has crushed the policy of the "uncontrollables" and the Trotskyist agents, overwhelmed in the tragic days of May which they themselves provoked.

Historically the victory over Fascism will belong to the Spanish people. Thanks to the Communist Party of Spain and the P.S.U.C., thanks to the policy of the Popular Front, the mighty forces of the people have been put in motion, which will guarantee our triumph over the black forces of Spanish and international reaction. We have now to figure out our new political line for the stage that is commencing. Our proletariat, and the whole Spanish people, have created the conditions necessary for victory, but the latter will not be obtained if the fight is not conducted on systematic lines.

4. The Tasks of the New Stage

The situation has changed deeply in our favour, and this favourable change will greatly benefit the faster we work. Between ourselves and the Fascists there is a sort of race. The Fascists stake all on precipitating the climax, and since they have not our capacity for resistance, this is the only way in which they could win. We have had to suffer for a year under the weight of unfavourable conditions and discouraging events. So it is necessary to draw the maximum amount of benefit from the time factor.

(a) *In the Military Sphere*

The Party has worked unceasingly for the creation of a Popular Regular Army, in ten months of intense and dangerous struggle. The Party never forgot that the keystone of its work was the creation of this army. We have been accused of desiring a mercenary army in the old style, through hatred of the ideology of the militia. When we maintain that one army has to have another one to face it, they put us down as counter-revolutionaries. When we say that the militias were not able to win the war, they class us as traitors. When we beg for the creation of reserves in Catalonia, they will ask us where are the necessary arms. And the best part of it is, that those who ask us this question are just the people who had

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the arms. Our line was so correct that it won over the great masses of the people. And to-day the Popular Regular Army is already a glorious reality. Through it the position on the fronts has changed. As on the Madrid front and the Southern front, so it has been and will be on all the Republican fronts.

The army has not enough men to launch a definite offensive, but the question of numbers is already virtually settled. What is still not settled is the question of quality. We need an army whose ranks will be purged of those individuals whom experience has proved to be incapable, indifferent, or even traitors—an army with military discipline that takes on its own shape in the trenches and military schools, an army with young military instructors, energetic and politically capable.

There is something else that we have to take into account. At the start there were only volunteers, and in their ranks were Fascists too. To-day we see in the army all the young men who have done their military service, whether workers or not, Fascists or anti-Fascists. Although the number of Fascists in our country has diminished, we have to take into account the fact that there exists a percentage of young men who go into the army against their wish. Moreover, there are others who go in, not only against their wish, but with the avowed intention of treachery. Here is the necessity for a solid army that by its ideological and moral superiority can absorb all those whose interests are opposed to our cause.

Another of the fundamental watchwords of to-day is to have a well commanded army. Perhaps the biggest fault was that the command of the regular army had not been created in a revolutionary manner. This was one of the gravest errors of the Largo Caballero Government. Their decree made it impossible for officers of the second degree to progress any further. The military policy of the Republic had to be completely changed. Who had to take command in the heroic hours of the struggle? Workers who had learned military procedure in the war itself. Certainly there were valued soldiers faithful to the Government. The people esteemed them and placed them in honoured and prominent positions. But they were very few. For this reason the officers of the Popular Army had to be elected from the men in the trenches, from the workers and peasants trained in the struggle. So the trend of military activity in Catalonia is not satisfactory. The necessary transformation of the Aragon front does not follow the same lines as the other fronts. It is essential to get together and speed up the pace of all our activities, so that Catalonia in all its wonderful strength may meet its obligations. Precisely because we wish this of Catalonia, we say that it has not yet reached this position, and has still to do so.

C

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(b) *War, Industry, Economics and Labour Discipline*

For an army of good quality, we require a powerful war industry. This is the old cry of our Party. And if we insist on this, it is because in Catalonia there exists the means to create this powerful war industry.

There was a time when we had to combat the tendency to create a particularist army ; that was the definite aim of the most extreme separatists. Neither the Aragon front nor the war industry, which was not of Catalan but of an anarchist type, was the particular affair of Catalonia.

There exists, then, a need to reorganise the war industry from the bottom upwards. This reorganisation will be carried out in a specialised and disciplined manner ; with a plan of production, a knowledge of basic materials, responsibility for the quantity and quality of production, a single superior and technical administration, and no factory committees. This will mean the centralisation of the war industry and the militarisation of the factories and transport services.

At the same time we will have to get down to the security of all our industries, to the reorganisation of the economic life of our country, destroyed by the committees and most of all by the " uncontrollables," to the regulation of wages, and impersonal direction with full technical powers and responsibility.

Up to now the chaotic situation has meant the disappearance of credit. No costings have existed, nor have there been any plans of production or any technical direction. There have been factories in which, through lack of money, they could not buy the necessary raw materials ; whereas in other factories they were manufacturing these same materials, of which only a part was sold. This situation has to undergo a radical change. The great majority of our workers are revolutionary, and there will be no difficulty in breaking free from these errors, committed not on their own initiative, but in consequence of the pseudo-revolutionary régime. The reorganisation and centralisation of the fourteen separate branches of industry has already been indicated by the creation of the General Council, the work of our Party in the Council of the Generalitat.

The task of the central organisation of our industry will be permanently impossible if we do not take a strong attitude towards the revision of the collectivisation decree, which would put an end to ineffectual syndicalist experiments. Revision, some say ? Yes, revision ; not by going back, but by advancing in such a manner that will result in nationalisation.

The actual system of equality of wages is anti-proletarian and anti-economic. The system gives the irresponsible workers grounds for not feeling the need of pulling their weight in the community. The present wage system acts as a brake on production and contributes enormously to the lowering of the workers' standard of living. This system does not

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make for a big increase in production, and consequently we shall have to combat it. For example, a metal worker specialising in the war industry earns 30 per cent. less than a bricklayer, who even though he does not work every day, receives his week's salary just the same. This cannot be called revolutionary. The scandalous fact that in the basic war industries the workers earn less than those engaged in trades useless to the war cannot be classed as revolutionary. This is counter-revolution. So there is the need for fixing a different wage for skilled workers ; a system of salaries which will encourage better and greater production. There has to be a special wage for the technicians who find themselves in the service of the war and revolution, and a recognition of the principle that where women do the same work as men they receive the same salary.

The collectivised factories belong to the workers, but not to the working class. In the factory meetings committees are elected. In the above mentioned meetings is also elected the imaginary representative of the Generalitat whom the union of the concern can do away with whenever they find it convenient. This régime of factory parliaments, of economic committees makes these establishments into independent corporations, and at the best of times they do no more than work for the private interests of the collectivised institutions. The committee system has to be replaced by proper direction of the factories, having full powers of responsibility.

The factory committees can remain as the medium of control for which they have been created. Working in this way there will not be possible any repetition of the case where a technician of great capacity directs a small industrial concern, whereas another technician of average ability has control of a large factory without possessing the capacity to do so. And over all the establishments and technicians will be the General Council of Industry, which will have supreme command and power of co-ordination, and will be the body to formulate the plans of the industrial branches, and assure the high standard of quantity and quality.

The factories have to establish this new discipline. In war victory is not possible without discipline. On the labour front there cannot be victory without discipline. And all those who give in to weakness, and do not concentrate all their power in work, cannot be called revolutionary workers. The war and the revolution impose sacrifices, and during the war and the period of time necessary for reconstruction the working class will not be able to achieve a high standard of living. But we have to pursue unceasingly the struggle for the working class, so that they may obtain the maximum benefit according to the possibilities of the moment. It is necessary to organise the struggle against speculation, against the hoarders, and make a just distribution of necessities among the workers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

5. The Trade Unions and the New Situation

Our Party considers that in the new situation of war and revolution, the unions have the following essential duties to carry out: (1) Betterment of the position of the working class, and helping the workers to organise their lives on better lines. Create for the workers all the commodities compatible with the interests of the war; fight against speculation, and the hoarding of primary necessary articles, and raise the new culture of the workers. (2) Co-operate with the Government in the better organisation and rationalisation of production, in the reorganisation of the wages system, and of control in the factories, in the creation of a new war and labour discipline, to fight against sabotage by the fascist and counter-revolutionary elements in the factories; especially in those industries affecting the war.

Our Party struggles with sincerity for the loyal co-operation of the two great union centres, the U.G.T. and the C.N.T., the first step towards arriving at a united organisation. But we consider that this unity of action does not have to be confined to hollow declarations and committee meetings, from which nothing results; we have to judge by the concrete results of work accomplished. There needs to be built up an executive that assures its dominance over the existing unions and over the actions of the "uncontrollables."

This unity of action will be impossible, as long as there is no agreement on a fundamental question. We believe that the unions have a great part to play in the common struggle, but we consider it an error that they should direct the economic and political life of the country. The unions cannot possibly have the ideological and organic cohesion that characterises the proletarian revolutionary party, our party in Catalonia, the Communist Party in Spain, and now the United Proletarian Spanish Party. The U.G.T. is leaving the Government of its own will, and is returning to its fruitful work of putting an end to the negative results of anarcho-syndicalist experiment. We desire that the C.N.T. will return to its camp, and take more into account its traditional policy, when certain members of the C.N.T. forget their ambition of returning to the posts in the Government that they vacated of their own free will. The solution of this problem will mean the speedy realisation of unity of action between the U.G.T. and C.N.T.

6. The Catalan National Problem

To-day we have to speak of the actual position of our Party with regard to the National Problem of Catalonia. You have seen that the speculators of nationalism are returning to us. They are the same who by their disabilities and weakness made possible the loss of Catalan prestige before the rest of Spain, and before European democracy. They are the same

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people who now weep crocodile tears, crying out at the loss of public order, and bemoaning that the command of the army has passed into the hands of the Republican Government. They also try to make believe that the Statute of autonomy of Catalonia is in danger. On the contrary, we are able to affirm that the Statute of autonomy is already safe, thanks to the methodical co-operation of the Popular Front Government in Valencia and Barcelona.

We have to repel with the greatest zeal the artifices of the false nationalists and speculators who are afraid of our power and seek to irritate the feeling of the Catalan people, and organise against the Republican Government and us. We are not centralists. We defend the principle of self-determination. We only claim that the central State will have to shoulder the burden of public order, in striving for the common victory. We claim that the central State will have to take upon itself the task of military organisation, because of the pressing needs of the war which exist, already perturbed by ten months of sabotage.

In the actual situation the best and only national policy is the revitalisation of Catalonia with regard to the war ; reorganisation of its industry ; the mobilisation of agriculture and all material and human resources. In this way Catalonia, in the common struggle of all the Spanish people against international Fascism, may occupy its rightful position. The right of the Catalan people to manage their own affairs, by the defeat of international Fascism, by the crushing of the intervening troops, and the liberating of all Spanish territory in the hands of foreign invaders. The position of the Party on this national question is clear, and will be understood by the masses. Possibly the tools of false nationalism slander our " centralisation." We shall survive that since the people of Catalonia stand by us in our affirmation that " Catalonia cannot be free if the rest of Spain falls a victim to Fascism. Spain cannot be free without the aid of Catalonia."

7. The United Party of the Catalan Proletariat

In a year of life and struggle dedicated to the defence of the interests of the people and the working class, the P.S.U.C. has been transformed into the great United Party of the proletariat of Catalonia. This is the most important event in the history of the re-birth of Catalonia. This truly prodigious expansion causes indignation in the ranks of certain parties and syndicalist organisations. These people, analysing the causes of the rapid and organic expansion of our party and the enormous increase in its influence, launch against the Party—as was the case in Spain with our great brother Party—the accusation of being a turncoat. To these people we answer the following : the P.S.U.C. does not hold interests that differ or are contrary to the people and the proletariat. Already it

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is a proletarian party ; flesh and blood of the working class, and of all anti-Fascist people. In our party more than 60 per cent. of the militants are industrial workers, and some 20 per cent. are land workers. And if to these percentages we add the office employees, school masters, and in short all the wage earners, we can affirm that our Party is made up of 97 per cent. of salaried workers, and the remaining 3 per cent. of members of free professions, and a small part of the petite bourgeoisie. We are the authentic proletarian party of Catalonia, a Marxist-Leninist party that follows the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, adhering to the Communist International, and being the brother party of the great and heroic Communist Party of Spain, the self-denying champion of the Spanish United Proletarian Party.

Our aim is the constant struggle for the creation of one single regular Popular Army for the Republic, while others in the name of pseudo-revolution try to sabotage it. Our testimonials are the commissars and soldiers of our party, who fell on the fronts of Aragon, Madrid and Andalusia. The struggle, full of sacrifices, against the " uncontrollables "; a struggle in which some of the most valued leaders of our party, as our greatly esteemed comrade Antonio Sese and our much needed Roldan Cortada, have fallen. Our testimonials are the examples that our fighters such as Lina Odona, typical of the heroic Catalan woman, have given by their life and death.

Our recommendation is the struggle against the robbers of public funds ; against the elements of corruption and decomposition that intend to make of the war and revolution a negative quantity. Also there is the work done by our three representatives in the Government for the benefit of the war and the workers. Our credentials are the magnificent mobilisation of the Catalan workers, the mobilisation of ten thousand comrades of the party for the front, the strong systematic plan of victory to free Catalonia from the turmoil in which she had been plunged by the " uncontrollables " and the Trotskyist satelites of Fascism.

Do you think, comrades, that if our policy had been so devilish we would have won over the great majority of Catalonia ? Is it contrary to the general interests that we have arrived at the full realisation of our aims ?

8. The Party of Anti-Fascist Unity

We do not wish to hurt anyone as long as they fight honestly against Fascism. We desire to maintain friendly relations with the C.N.T. and with all working-class organisations. We wish to forge closer and friendlier relationships with the Union of Farmers and the Republican parties, representatives of the petit bourgeois anti-Fascists in the Popular Front. We have no enemies in the anti-Fascist camp. The enemies are on the other side of the trenches. The enemies are the Fascists,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Trotskyists, and the " uncontrollables " ; the latter fortunately in open liquidation. The expression of Trotskyism, the P.O.U.M. we do not consider as a political party, as was clearly demonstrated in the counter-revolutionary uprising of May. A Fascist agency, organiser of the counter-revolutionary " putsch," slanderer of the U.S.S.R., dividing factor of the anti-fascist Popular Front, it is the most dangerous and hypocritical enemy of the proletariat and anti-Fascism.

Our party, in spite of its youth, has educated thousands of people in the most essential and fundamental principles of Marxism. It has educated them by its everyday conduct and selfless example ; by its heroism in the cause of the proletariat and anti-Fascism. The knowledge and understanding of Marxist theories is considered as indispensable. For without revolutionary theory, the party would not be able to determine in a scientific manner its line, strategy, and the tasks of to-day that build and make provision for the morrow.

There still exist strong traces of sectarianism in our Party. These existed because of the lack of knowledge of the living condition of the workers, by some leading comrades in the party. In the first year of its existence the Party has consolidated itself ideologically ; its inner unity has been reinforced, and it has become an almost single Bolshevik party. We still have not reached the point that we desire, but we shall reach it. The traces of the parties which originally combined in the unification have disappeared, and the tens of thousands of old militants of our party have become welded together on the foundation of a clear programme, radiating from the Central Committee, the controlling body of the Party. Unity was the dynamic force present at the birth of the Party, and the Party has built up, strengthened and consolidated this unity. The Party is solid, and in every case will know how to liquidate, in a Bolshevik manner, any manœuvre from outside directed against the indestructible unity of Catalonia.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOLIDAYS WITH PAY: A VITAL ISSUE

By H. S. GORDON

EIGHT months after Tory members of Parliament contemptuously rejected a private bill to establish holidays with pay, the question has become one of practical politics. That, in itself, is a significant indication of the pressure which a properly organised campaign by the Labour Party and T.U.C. is capable of exerting. Holidays with pay as a practical and immediate objective have captured the imagination of millions of trade unionists and Labour Party supporters. Resolutions demanding their adoption throughout industry will be carried at the Norwich T.U.C. and the Bournemouth Conference of the Labour Party. They will be tabled, automatically, in future applications by the trade unions.

So far, so good, but there is, nevertheless, an obvious danger in the change of front with which big industry is coming to regard the proposal. The private bill, introduced by a Labour member, was killed when an amendment was adopted which would have had the effect of holding up operation of the reform until, in the view of the Minister of Labour, industry would be capable of bearing the increased strain. Conservative members, unwilling to incur the odium of rejecting a measure already in operation in the majority of democratic European countries, protested that they supported "the principle" of the Bill. The government, faced with a similar dilemma, appointed a Committee representing the employers and trade unions to consider the whole problem.

Since then the newspapers of Lord Beaverbrook and Lord Camrose have expressed support for the proposal. Influential employers have declared in favour. The Engineering Employers' Federation have actually granted holidays with pay when no such claim was submitted in the application of the unions. Trade union leaders have special cause to fear the Greeks when they come with gifts. They will need to be wary that the granting of what is, after all, a minor concession, is not used to forestall the wider demands called for by rising profits, higher cost of living and ever-increased speed up.

An analysis of the recent engineering settlement serves as an illustration. The original demand of 3d. an hour increase called for by the National Committee of the Amalgamated Engineering Union was reduced by the Joint Trades Committee to 2d. Of this modest claim, the employers have conceded ¾d. an hour to be paid in two instalments, and have

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

secured a " gentlemen's agreement " that no further application will be made by the unions until May, 1938. During this period, higher prices will more than wipe out the wage increases, while the expiring of the truce may well see the industry on the verge of a new slump with its accompaniment of vicious wage cuts inflicted at a moment when the unions are least able to make an effective fight. Holidays with pay are the sugar on the pill. They represent on an average about ¼d. an hour to all workers in the industry. They do not operate until next year and are financed from a fund established by each federated firm into which a sum is to be paid, equal to one-fiftieth of the time-rate in respect of each full week's work. No employee will thus receive more than one week's holiday at his time rate, which will be substantially less than his normal earnings. In the case of short-time weeks, the holiday fund will be reduced accordingly.

No hard and fast machinery appears to be laid down to provide for men who change their jobs during the year, although it is assumed that employees will collect their holiday pay from the firms concerned, in proportion to the time worked. The unions will need to take special precautions to ensure that this part of the agreement is honoured, for the employers, who are at present faced with a shortage of skilled men, would welcome an opportunity of counteracting mobility of labour in the industry.

These considerations do not destroy the value of an agreement which, for the first time, lays down the principle of paid holidays for a basic industry employing some half-a-million workers. The achievement of the engineers may well serve as a starting point for other unions ; what is important, is that the demand for holidays should not be allowed to stand alone. The shorter working week and holidays with pay are the unions' answer to speed up in industry, which has increased output in mine, factory and workshop by an average of 20 per cent. in nine years. Reduction of hours from 48 to 40 would be equal approximately to a wage increase of 16 per cent ; one week's holiday with pay represents an addition of 2 per cent. Employers whose soaring profits are threatened by the demand for improved conditions may well decide that industry is " able to bear the burden " of paid holidays and by so doing short-circuit the far more vital claim for shorter hours.

Proposals submitted by the T.U.C. to the Committee of Inquiry give support to the contention that the new-found enthusiasm for holidays with pay on the part of certain employers is not devoid of ulterior motive. Sir Walter Citrine pointed out that resolutions calling for legislation on the subject have been discussed and passed by Annual Congresses since 1911, and that during the last quarter-of-a-century many affiliated unions have pressed for agreements incorporating the reform.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Briefly, the scheme of the General Council relies primarily on collective agreements to be given legal force by Act of Parliament. It is claimed that the method will ensure the necessary flexibility and variety in the operation of the plan. The Council proposed a fortnight's annual holiday and a qualifying period of service of one year which may be spent in the service of one or several employers. Legislation would also be favoured by the Council whereby employers and workpeople in each industry or group of trades would be required to submit an agreed draft scheme for the approval of the Minister of Labour leaving the Minister responsible for producing a scheme, after consultation, in the event of failure to do so by the parties concerned after a specific date. To meet the case of seasonal casual and other forms of discontinuous employment, the Council cited the experience of France and Belgium, where central or compensation funds have been set up, and suggested that a similar method could be adopted in the light of experience gained in the administration of unemployment insurance.

The weakness of the General Council's scheme lies in the industries still practically unorganised, in which provision of paid holidays by any means other than blanket legislation, would meet with tremendous difficulties. There are, for example, half-a-million male and female workers in the catering trades, no more than one per cent. of whom are members of a trade union. The distributive trades, in spite of valuable work by the Shop Assistants' Union and the National Union of Distributive and Allied Workers still present, in many sections, a dismal picture of unorganised and sweated labour.

If at Norwich, Congress determines to make a new attempt to close these weaknesses, even if it means in the case of the catering industry advocating drastic steps to deal with the four rival unions at present attempting to deal with the problem, it will take a big step forward.

It is estimated that there are about 3,500,000 people in Great Britain who receive paid holidays, the majority through trade union agreements. Some 14,000,000 will be affected if the principle is extended to all persons in insured employment. Such legislation would merely bring Britain into line with the Soviet Union, New Zealand, the Irish Free State, the Scandinavian States, Czechoslovakia, France, Belgium, Switzerland, and many other countries. The "National" government has not only opposed the reform at home, but has done its best to prevent its adoption internationally. Only last June it abstained from voting at the International Labour Office, for the proposed convention to provide paid holidays for every class of worker. It now awaits the report of the Committee of Inquiry which will probably be available early in the New Year.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If, as is likely, the Committee decides in favour of the scheme, Mr. Chamberlain will be in a dilemma. He may carry through legislation in time for the next General Election, or alternatively may incorporate paid holidays in his next election programme. In either event, the Tory Party will be well placed to steal the thunder of the Short Term programme.

The alternative for delegates at Norwich and Bournemouth is to press for holidays with pay, not as an isolated demand, but as an essential part of their wider programme in both the industrial and political sphere.

Has Your Party a Local Paper?
if not, get into touch with
THE WORKERS' MONTHLY ●
which offers a remarkably cheap service to Labour Parties, **through its Localised Editions**

FOUNDED 1926—Going Stronger than Ever
Frankly Challenging
Specimen copy 1½d. Postal subscription, 12 months, 1/6

Manager, "W.M." "Brixham," The Mount, Guildford, Surrey

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REARMAMENT AND LABOUR CONDITIONS

By JOHN KNIGHT

THE consequences of the rearmament programme of the Government upon labour conditions are so manifold and far-reaching that we can touch upon only some important points within the frame of an article.

1. Warmongers and rearmament profiteers often point out that intensive rearmament absorbs more and more unemployed workers. We already know this argument from Hitler, Goering, and others—and though nobody would deny that rearmament means more work at present, no worker should regard this fact as an argument in support of rearmament. If the Government were to shoot every unemployed worker such action undoubtedly would diminish the number of unemployed workers—and yet nobody would dare to advocate such a measure. Getting workers to produce armaments is more profitable to employers than shooting them right away—if the workers produce armaments this merely means a delay in the shooting! For the weapons which the workers produce are to be directed against workers, are in fact to be used in the next war, that is the next mass slaughter of the toiling masses of the world. These weapons are to be used for the conquest of new spheres of exploitation at the expense of the lives of many millions of workers. This, then, is our answer to those who praise the rearmament programme as a means of reducing unemployment: *The workers do not want less unemployment if unemployment is decreased through measures which must lead to the massacre of millions of their comrades. The workers want less unemployment, but they want it brought about at the expense of the rich and to the benefit of the oppressed.*

2. Rearmament means, as we have explained in another article.* increased cost of living and continuous pressure on the worker's standard of living. While those who up to recently had been unemployed and who have now found work through the rearmament programme undoubtedly have experienced an improvement in their living conditions, a sort of last supper before their sacrifice in the next war, many millions of workers undergo an appreciable deterioration in their living conditions because of the increasing prices.

* Cf. THE LABOUR MONTHLY, June, 1937, The Financial Consequences of Rearmament.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. Rearmament means an increasing differentiation of labour conditions. Key workers in the armament industry are paid comparatively high wages—while the rank and file in the armament industry are paid low wages, and still lower wages in other industries. The employers hope to drive a wedge between the workers through wage differentiation. They hope in this way to corrupt a small strata of highly skilled workers, to use them as strike breakers, and to keep down with their help the great mass of severely suffering workers. And if they have to give in occasionally to the mass of the armament workers they try to do so at the expense of the workers in other industries, in the textile industry, in the food industry, partly also of the unemployed workers, etc. There is, of course, only one answer to these attempts by the ruling class to play off the different groups of workers against each other: aggressive unity.

Never since the end of the war has there been a better time for the workers of this country to compel the employers to increase their wages again and again than the present. The ruling class wants to rearm at all costs. We shall, of course, fight this rearmament programme. But this fight must not be confined to parliamentary opposition and to mass meetings against the war danger. It requires attacks on another front, and the spirit of these attacks must be: allright, if we cannot hinder rearmament to-day, they at least must pay for this rearmament. The ruling class must not benefit, must not make profits from rearmament. As long as capitalism reigns we are not in a position to stop war profiteering completely. But even under capitalism we are able to diminish rearmament profits. We can do this by demanding higher wages, holidays with pay, etc. The fight for higher wages, at the same time, becomes not only a fight for better living conditions, and a fight against war profiteering, but it also becomes a veritable training school for the workers, a preparation in fact for bigger battles with capitalism. To strike under all circumstances in order to learn to fight is nonsense. We cannot learn to fight if all the odds are from the very beginning against us. But to-day, when the employers have shown repeatedly that if the workers are fighting under really firm leadership they are ready to give in in order to save their contracts, to safeguard the continuity of production, and in order to enjoy their profits, even if they are somewhat smaller because of the wage demands of the workers—to-day the conditions are such that the chances of the workers gaining some advantages from large scale strikes are very great indeed.

Thus, the workers have to fight on two fronts against the rearmament programme: on the one front they attack the rearmament programme as such and explain to the masses of indifferent or of deluded people what the rearmament programme really means and to what it must lead; and on the other front they fight the employers and try to curtail their profits as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much as possible not by outcries against war profiteering but by demanding and fighting for higher wages, holidays with pay, etc.

4. A rearmament programme such as that undertaken by the Government means orders in bulk, means orders of an extent never experienced before in times of peace. Such a programme finds industry quite unprepared, and while all firms are lagging behind in the execution of their orders, each tries to be more efficient than the other in order to secure more and larger orders. Efficient under such circumstances means getting the utmost out of the workers. Getting the utmost out of the workers means either prolonging the working day or (and) increasing the intensity of work per hour. No data are available for production per man in the war industries. But even the general figures for industry as a whole reflect the speed up :

Year First Quarter	*Production*	*Employed*	*Production per Employed*
1934 ..	100	100	100
1937 ..	125	112	112

In the war industries the increase of production per employee was, of course, still very much greater than these figures indicate. At the same time, wage rates have increased only half as much, while the cost of living increased so much that real wage rates declined by 2 per cent. : *an increase of output per employed man of about 12 per cent., and a decline of real wage rates of 2 per cent. ; such is the balance for the last three years.*

5. The speed up and the increased intensity of work, must lead to an increase in the number of accidents. The workers are less and less protected against accidents, partly because they get much more fatigued and are, therefore, less able to watch out as carefully as the working process demands, partly because the safety measures and apparatus are even less adequate under conditions of the newly-increased intensity of work. The Chief Inspector of Factories sums up his 1936 report on accidents :

> A rising toll of death and injury must still be regarded as a penalty to be paid for increased prosperity.

In order for profits to attain new heights in 1936, over 175,000 had to be injured in factories during that year, and nearly 1,000 had to be killed. In the armament centres the number of accidents increased more rapidly than anywhere else. While accidents increased from 1935 to 1936 by about 18 per cent. for industry as a whole, Gateshead, Sheffield, Middlesbrough and Lanarkshire showed increases of 25 per cent. upward to 50 per cent.

Of special significance is the increase of accidents among the young workers. Immediately after having left school the children are taken on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the factories and set to work at a pace which affects them like machine gun fire, one after the other being thrown out of work in rapid succession because of accidents. According to the Chief Inspector's report, about 25 per cent. of the girls and 10 per cent. of the boys were injured during the first week of their employment.

Such has been the mass injury of juvenile workers during recent months that even the employers are alarmed. Not so much because of the poor maimed children as because of the deleterious effects which such a wholesale incapacitation of newly-employed workers has upon the production process.

It is partly for this reason that Lord Austin appealed, according to the *Evening Standard*, July 14, 1937:

> for a return to apprenticeship methods, and for the institution of practical work in secondary schools, to prepare boys as skilled and semi-skilled workers for industries calling for specialised craftsmen.

6. The other reason for this appeal is the shortage of skilled workers, workers that are skilled in the preparation of armaments. This shortage is met to-day by the employers attempting to split up the working process in such a way that less skilled workers are also able to do the work. This splitting up has many advantages for the employers. Firstly, the lower number of highly skilled key workers, the less money to be spent in attempts at corrupting this group of workers. For, with the key workers on their side in a situation when a strike is about to break out, and with the vast amount of work done by semi-skilled workers who can comparatively easily be replaced by outside workers, the employers believe themselves to be in a much stronger position in face of labour demands.

The training of school children for armament work must be opposed by the workers just as much as they oppose the military training of schoolboys. Mr. S. W. Alexander, the notorious reactionary interpreter of economic and financial matters, writing every day in the *Evening Standard*, comments on July 14, 1937, on the speech by Lord Austin:

> Lord Austin will be condemned to-day by a good many people as a wicked industrialist trying to get cheap labour. . . . . The only way to get skilled workers is to get the youth of the country out into the works . . . . at an early age. . . . . Some school teachers oppose this because they know it must mean a great loss of influence to them and a reduction in their numbers . . . ."

As if it were a question of school teachers regarding such training as a restriction of their " power over school children." The workers of Great Britain, the parents of the school children will convince Mr. Alexander that it is not a question of diminishing influence of teachers over children, but of increasing exploitation of workers' children, and Lord Austin will find himself opposed not by some teachers " out for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more influence over children " but by the masses of the people who do not regard training for the production of armaments as the proper education of their children, who do not think that factory work can't start early enough, and who do not regard it as an ideal occupation for their children if they succeed in turning out tanks and machine guns and munitions at a record speed for the benefit of the armament racketeers —weapons to kill the workers of others countries, weapons to conquer new sources of profit for the employing class of Great Britain, weapons, moreover, which, if the employers have their way, will one day be turned against the Soviet Union.

7. At the same time the workers suffer from the increased anarchy which the rapid pushing of the rearmament programme at the expense of everything else causes. Workers in automobile factories are suddenly dismissed for a day or so, workers in a refrigerator or agricultural implements producing concern are suddenly put on short time—because the necessary raw materials are not at hand, being used in the armament industries. Though more workers are employed than before, the security of constant work has declined in many industries.

In the course of time the whole employment situation changes in so far as more and more workers are employed in the production of armaments while other industries because of lack of raw materials or even because of lack of labour begin to shrink. During 1936, for instance, more than 32,000 workers left the land, and England's agricultural area shrank by 80,000 acres. More and more labour is employed in the production of goods of destruction, fewer and fewer workers in the production of goods for consumption. More and more workers lose their skill in producing goods for the general well-being of the masses, as more and more workers are trained as war preparers. From the point of view of industrial skill and training the whole of the working population becomes less and less fit for production in a workers' state. *The attempts to mislead labour ideologically are accompanied by a continuous mistraining of labour in industrial technique. The workers are taught things which they will not be able to use in a society which builds workers' houses and which prefers to produce enough clothing and food for the masses of the people rather than tanks and machine guns.*

8. Armament workers are often working under special rules, sworn to all kinds of secrecy, exposed to continuous spying, occasionally deprived of benefits which the trade unions have gained for the workers, for instance, such as the restriction of the right of employers to dismiss a worker without good cause, etc. The greater the number of armament workers, the greater the number of workers deprived of many of the privileges gained during the last hundred years of trade union struggle against the employers. The liberty of the worker as far as he enjoys any, becomes

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more and more restricted. Fascist, dictatorial, reactionary rules become more and more widespread. The armament factories are a training ground for the fascists of this country, and the bigger the rearmament programme, that is the more armament production expands, the bigger does this training ground become. *Fighting the rearmament programme, keeping the workers in fighting trim, keeping them alive to all the dangers the rearmament programme means for the workers of this country, thus, not only means anti-war activity, not only means a fight against armament profiteering and for a better standard of living, but also includes the fight for the few liberties the workers of this country have gained during the last hundred years.*

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

For Peace and Friendship. Verbatim Report of the Second National Congress of Peace and Friendship with the U.S.S.R. (Gollancz.) 202 pp. 4s. 6d.

Youth in Industry. John Gollan. (Gollancz.) 344 pp. 6s.

The Labour Party in Perspective. Rt. Hon. C. R. Attlee, M.P. (Gollancz.) 287 pp. 7s. 6d.

Le Marxisme et la Question Nationale et Coloniale. J. Staline. (Editions Sociales Internationales, Paris.) 344 pp. 20f.

Episodes et Vies Revolutionnaires : Sergo Ordjonikidzé (1886-1937. 79 pp. 2f. ; *Etienne Marcel ou le Précurseur Inconnu.* 96 pp. 2f. ; *Paris Sous la Commune.* 100 pp. 2f. (Bureau d'Editions, Paris).

Karl Marx et sa Doctrine. V. I. Lénine. (Bureau d'Editions, Paris.) 62 pp. 2f. 50.

The Changing Scene. Arthur Calder-Marshall. (Chapman and Hall). 271 pp. 10s. 6d.

The Rationalisation and Conservation of the Timber Resources of the World. Dr. A. H. Unwin. (Technical Press Ltd.) 48 pp. 2s. 6d.

Soviet Geography. N. Mikhaylov. (Methuen.) 229 pp. 10s. 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LENIN AND GORKY

[*We continue this month the series of Lenin's Letters to Maxim Gorky, which have been specially translated for the* LABOUR MONTHLY.]

No. 212.

To A. M. Gorky, at Capri (Italy).
[PERSONAL TO AL. M-CH.]
(March 24, 1908. Geneva.)

Dear A.M.,

I have received your letter about my fight with the Machists. I fully understand and respect your feelings and must say that I am receiving something similar from the Petersburg friends, but I am profoundly convinced that you are wrong.

You must and do, of course, understand that once a party man has become convinced of the profound error and *harmfulness* of a certain doctrine, then he is obliged to speak out against it. I would not kick up a fuss if I were not absolutely convinced (and on this I am more and more convinced every day, the more I become acquainted with the sources of the wisdom of Bazarov, Bogdanov and Co.) that their book[1] is entirely ridiculous, pernicious, philistine, clerical, from beginning to end, from branch to root, to Mach and Avenarius. Plekhanov is *completely* right in his opposition to them in essence, only he cannot or does not want or is too lazy to say so *concretely*, thoroughly, simply, without intimidating the public excessively with philosophical subtleties. And I will say so *in my own way* at all costs.

What " reconciliation " is possible in this case, dear A.M. ? Goodness, it is ridiculous even to suggest it. A battle is *absolutely* unavoidable. And party people must direct their efforts not to plastering up or shelving or dodging, but to seeing that the practically necessary party work *does not suffer*. *You* must see to this ; and nine-tenths of the Russian Bolsheviks will help you in it and will say thank you heartily.

How is that to be done ? By " neutrality ? " No. There cannot and *will not* be neutrality in this question. If one can use such a word, then it can only be in a *conventional* sense : it is necessary to isolate all this struggle from the fraction. Hitherto, you have been writing " outside," apart from fractional publications ; go on writing thus. Only in this way will the fraction not be involved, will it not be *implicated*, will it not be obliged to-morrow or the day after to *decide, to vote*, i.e., to convert the struggle into something chronic, protracted and without issue.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That is why I am *against* publishing anything philosophical in the journal.[2] I know they will rail at me for this: He wants to put a gag on others, though not opening his own mouth! But you think it over calmly.

The journal with philosophy in it would look like this. In number 1, three articles by Bazarov, Bogdanov and Lunacharsky against Plekhanov. My one article, where I would say that *Outlines of the Philosophy of Marxism*=Berdyaevism and clericalism.

In number 2—thrice three articles by Bogdanov, Bazarov and Lunacharsky against Plekhanov and Lenin in a very excited tone. One article, where from another angle I would prove that *Outlines of the Philosophy of Marxism*=clericalism.

In number 3—howling and abuse!

I could write six or a dozen articles against *Outlines of the Philosophy of Marxism*, an article against each author and against each of their points of view. Can it drag on in this way? How long? Won't *this* make a split *unavoidable* as a result of the endless aggravation and irritation? Won't that bind the fraction by a decision: decide, analyse and close "the discussion" by taking a vote.

Consider this well, if you are afraid of a split. Are the active members going to undertake to put out books with such "battles" in them? Isn't a different way better: write in the old way, apart from, outside the fractions, publications. Have your fight outside, the fraction will wait *for the time being*. If there is any possibility of weakening the inevitable embitterment, then this is the only way, in my opinion.

You write: the Mensheviks will benefit by the row. You are wrong, profoundly wrong, A.M. They will benefit if the Bolshevik fraction does not dissociate itself from the philosophy of the three Bolsheviks. *Then* they will benefit finally. But if the philosophical brawl is carried on outside the fraction, then the Mensheviks will finally be brought down to politics, and that will be the death of them.

I say: dissociate the brawl from the fraction. Of course, among living beings it is a little difficult and painful to make this cleavage. It will take time. It will need painstaking comrades. Here the practical workers will help, here you must help—here is "psychology," here are books to your hand. I think you could help a lot here—if, of course, after reading my pamphlet against *Outlines* you do not attack me with as much fury as I have attacked them.

Think well about the journal and let me have an answer quickly. I am a little doubtful whether it is worth while for us to come jointly to see you *now*. Why irritate nerves unnecessarily? "Seeing somebody

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

off on a long journey " . . . . but a fight is unavoidable. Isn't it better to decide this matter of the journal more simply without long parleys and without solemn and pointless congresses ? I am only putting these questions to you in order to consult you.

Warm greetings to M.F. I will most certainly come to Capri and I'll try to drag my wife along with me. Only I would like to do so independently of the philosophical struggle.

I warmly shake your hand,

Yours, LENIN.

P.S.—I enclose an *important* communication about a spy on you.

First published in 1924 in *Lenin Symposium*, I. Printed from the manuscript.

No. 214.

To A. M. Gorky, at Capri (Italy).
(April 16, 1908. Geneva.)

Dear A.M.,

I received your letter to-day and I hasten to answer. It is useless and harmful for me to visit you. I *cannot* and will not talk with people who have set out to preach the unification of scientific socialism with religion. The time of the copy-books is past. It is impossible to argue, stupid to try one's nerves to no purpose. It is necessary *to isolate* philosophy from party (fractional) affairs : a resolution of the Bolshevist centre[3] also makes this a duty.

Already I *have sent to press* the most formal declaration of war.[4] There is no longer room for diplomacy—I, of course, speak of diplomacy not in the bad sense, but in the good.

" Good " diplomacy on your side, dear A.M. (if you too haven't come to believe in God), should consist in the isolation of our common (*i.e.*, including myself in that number) tasks from philosophy.

Nothing will come now of a conversation about other things except philosophy : it would have an unnatural ring. However, if these *other* things, *not* philosophical, but, for example, *Proletary*, really need talking about just *now* and in Capri I might be able to come (I don't know whether I can find the money : there are difficulties just now), but I repeat : only on condition that I do not talk about philosophy and religion.

But I intend to come to you without fail to chat in freedom, after work is done.

I warmly shake your hand,

Yours, LENIN.

Warm greetings to M.F. : I suppose she isn't for God by any chance ?

First published in 1924 in *Lenin Symposium*, I. Printed from the manuscript.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No. 215.

To A. M. Gorky, at Capri (Italy).
(April 19, 1908. Geneva.)

Dear A.M.,

I got your and M.F.'s telegram, and am sending my refusal to-day or to-morrow morning. Once more I repeat that it is impermissible *in any circumstances* to mix up writers' disputes about philosophy with *party* (i.e., *fractional*) affairs. I have already written this to An.Vas. (Lunacharsky), and in order to avoid every sort of idle gossip and false conclusions from my refusal to come, *I repeat for all comrades :* We must conduct our fractional work harmoniously as before : not one of us has repented the policy which we followed and carried out at the time of the revolution. That means our duty is *to defend* and fight for it before the party. We can only do this all together and we must do it in *Proletary* and in all our work.

If meantime A swears at B or B swears at A over philosophy, we *must* do it separately, namely, without hindering our work.

I beg you and the comrades urgently not to place a bad interpretation on my refusal to come. I am very sorry, but I cannot come on account of the general state of affairs and the state of the editorial board.

I warmly shake all your hands,

Yours, LENIN.

We are awaiting the promised article on the Rome strike from An.Vas. as soon as possible.

From all writers we are awaiting help for *Proletary :* we are all responsible to the Russians, who are dissatisfied with it.

Let Al.Al. *go to the* greatest *trouble* about the money ! They are howling in Russia over the lack of finance !

First published in 1924 in *Lenin Symposium*, I. Printed from the manuscript.

No. 231.

To A. M. Gorky, at Capri (Italy).
(November 14, 1910. Paris.)

Dear A.M.,[5]

For a long time there has been no news whatever from you and M.F. I am sad without news from Capri. What is the matter ? It cannot be that you have been counting letters as they say some people count visits.

With us here everything is as before. A pile of petty little affairs and all kinds of unpleasantnesses connected with the struggle of the various " divisions " inside the party. Brrrr ! . . . . But it must be nice at Capri.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As a kind of relaxation from the squabbles, we have been busy with an old scheme for the publication of *Rabochaya Gazeta*.[6] We have collected 400 francs with difficulty. Yesterday at last No. 1 came out. I am sending it to you together with the leaflet and signature list. The members of the Capri-Naples colony who sympathise with this undertaking (and with the *rapprochement* between the Bolsheviks and Plekhanov) are invited to render assistance of every kind. *Rabochaya Gazeta* is necessary, but it is impossible to get anywhere with Trotsky, who is intriguing in favour of the liquidators and the *Otzovist* of the *Vperiods* group.[7] Already at Copenhagen, Plekhanov and I protested energetically against Trotsky's scurrilous article in *Vorwaerts*.[8] And what further villainy he has printed in *Neue Zeit* about the historical significance of the struggle among the Russian social democrats.[9] And Lunacharsky in the Belgian *Le Peuple*[10]—have you seen it ?

We are arranging for a small legal journal for the struggle with *Nasha Zarya* and *Zhizn*,[10] also with Plekhanov's collaboration. We hope very soon to bring out No. 1.

Such are our little affairs. Little by little, quietly, laboriously, we are nevertheless extricating ourselves from the squabbles on to the (right) path.

What news with you ? Have you written to Stroyev and what answer did you get ? We wrote him the first letter to establish "contact" ; he got it and answered that he did not understand who was writing. We wrote again. Silence. There's a devilish shortage of people, and the old ones have scattered.

We had almost managed, jointly with the Duma fraction, to get going a weekly paper in Petersburg (the local Mensheviks fortunately tend not towards the liquidators but towards Plekhanov), but the matter got held up again, the devil knows why.[11]

Write how you are getting on. Is work going well ? Is anything coming of the review about which you spoke in the summer ? How are things with *Znanie* ?[12]

I am entitled to be angry with M.F. She promised to write. Nothing. She promised to enquire about the Paris library of the history of the Russian revolution. Nothing. It isn't good.

I shake your hand,

Yours, LENIN.

But Tria's report will *nevertheless* probably be published. The editorial board of the C(entral) O(rgan) has decided this. Well, but there's such a squabble in this editorial board ; I can't stand it . . . .

First published in 1930 in *Lenin Symposium*, XIII. Printed from the manuscript.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES.

[1]*Outlines of the Philosophy of Marxism.*

[2]Gorky's projected journal, which was to have Bolshevik collaboration, but but never saw the light.

[3]The Bolshevik Centre was the Central Committee of the Bolshevik fraction of the R.S.D.R.P. (It must be remembered that at this time the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks were reunited in one party.) It was chosen by unanimous vote of the Bolshevik delegates to the London Congress in 1907, and consisted of Lenin, Bogdanov, and others. The resolution referred to laid down the isolation of philosophic disputes from fractional affairs and the impermissibility of allowing arguable questions of philosophy in the pages of the *Proletary*.

[4]Lenin is referring to an article of his: "Marxism and Revisionism" in a symposium *Karl Marx: for the twenty-fifth anniversary of his death,*" in which, in a footnote, he made clear his determination to analyse and attack Bogdanov and Co.'s *Outlines*.

[5]A considerable interval elapsed between the previous letter and the next written by Lenin to Gorky. Lenin's refusal to go to Capri to discuss the philosophical issues with Bogdanov, Lunacharsky and Co. marked the beginning of a split which finally led to the publication of Lenin's *Materialism and Empiriocriticism* in the spring of 1909, the opening of *Proletary's* columns to discussion of the disputed questions, and the decision of the Bolshevist Centre to exclude Bogdanov from its members. Meantime Gorky and the Bogdanov group had started a school for workers sent from Russia, which Lenin and the Bolshevik leaders with him regarded as an attempt to found a new fraction, and in which they refused to take part. On the exclusion of Bogdanov from the Bolshevik Centre and the exclusion of his group from the Bolshevik fraction the group founded a journal *Vperiod*, seeking to establish themselves as a special fraction of the R.S.D.R.P.

[6]*Rabochaya Gazeta*, a newspaper for workers generally, published by the Bolsheviks with the collaboration of Plekhanov and his adherents among the Mensheviks, running from 1910 to 1912, and issued in Paris. Altogether nine Nos. were issued.

[7]The "liquidators" were Mensheviks in favour of "liquidating" entirely the Party's illegal activities. The "Otzovists" were in favour of the complete withdrawal of the Party members elected to the Duma, and withdrawal from all forms of "participation" in the Duma (roughly, parliamentary) elections.

[8]"Die Russische Sozialdemokratie (von unser Russischen Korrespondent)" —*Vorwaerts* for August 28th, 1910. The article led to a protest being made by the R.S.D.R.P. delegation to the Copenhagen Congress of the 2nd International, which was sent to the Central Committee of the German Social Democratic Party. Trotsky's article was unsigned, but his authoriship was established at a conference of the delegation.

[9]"Die Entwicklungstendenzen der Russischen Sozialdemokratie." *Neue Zeit*, Sept. 9, 1910.

[9]"Les courants tactiques dans la parti social-democratique Russe." *Le Peuple*. August 23, 1910.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

[10]The journal in question was *Misl*, published in Moscow from December, 1910, to April, 1911. *Nasha Zarya* was the organ of the Menshevik liquidators and appeared in Petersburg from 1910 to 1914. *Zhizn* was an earlier journal of the Menshevik liquidators, published towards the end of 1910.

[11]The reference is to *Zviezda*, which did at last begin publication at the end of 1910, and ran for some years.

[12]*Znanie* was a publishing firm in Petersburg, of which Gorky was a shareholder.

LENIN'S WORKS (In Russian)

Complete in 31 volumes, price £3 17 6 and £7 7 0 the set.
Small editions of separate works range from 6d. to 2/6 each.

Selected works in six volumes, price **9/-** (second-hand).

COLLET'S Foreign Department, 31 Gerrard Street, London, W.1

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

AFRICA: A CONFUSED ARGUMENT

Africa and World Peace. By George Padmore. (Secker and Warburg.) 7s. 6d.

WITH all its vivacity and with the detailed historical record of imperialist policy over the last half century which it presents to us, this book is thoroughly confusing politically.

The book is confusing because (i) while recognising the imminence of war, it develops the argument that the League of Nations can never serve the cause of peace, being dominated by imperialist nations ; (ii) it ignores the principle of collective security, implying that the Soviet Union is a mere spectator of events and unconcerned with the position of the oppressed peoples.

In *How Britain Rules Africa*, published last year, Mr. Padmore took the racial idea of " Africa for the Africans " as one of his arguments, neglecting to draw any distinction between the white ruling class and the exploited and oppressed white masses, and thus adapting himself to the imperialist policy of dividing white and coloured workers.

What did this slogan " Africa for the Africans " mean ? William L. Patterson, political leader of the American Negroes, pointed out, when reviewing *How Britain Rules Africa*, that there are white Africans as well as black ; there is an African bourgeoisie, African landlords, as well as an African proletariat, toilers, farmers. What Africans is Africa to be for ?

Mr. Padmore had certainly presented a puzzling if not a definitely misleading picture.

Ignoring the economic causes of imperialism he implied that white peoples oppress coloured peoples because they are coloured and so can be represented as inferior, and, echoing Nazi racialism, he declared a race war from the platform of the Pan-African Federation. This starkly reactionary policy commended itself neither to the white nor the coloured workers. It has been dropped, for good let us hope, but while it was being expounded with the eloquence of Mr. Padmore it created bewilderment in the people's mind.

In the chapter " Abyssinia—a pawn in European diplomacy," Mr. Padmore has ably described the tortuous policy of the imperialist Powers. But the position which he so graphically depicts makes it clear that it was not the League of Nations which was inherently at fault, but the imperialist members of the League who were actively preventing the machinery of the Covenant from working.

It is undeniable that Abyssinia has been shamefully betrayed, that promises clearly made to her in international Treaties have been broken and that her efforts to bring her case before the League of Nations were sabotaged by the British and French Governments, who were indeed conniving at Mussolini's predatory policy.

" We shall now," says Mr. Padmore on p. 122, " turn our attention to the final phase of this great betrayal and examine the rôle played by Britain, France, and the League of Nations, the stalwart defenders of ' Collective Security and the rights of small nations.' "

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The British Labour Movement is seeking to strengthen and reinvigorate the League of Nations as an instrument of international co-operation and policy. The democracies of Europe are determined to support the League of Nations with its policy of collective security. If, therefore, Mr. Padmore attacks the League of Nations in the name of the oppressed colonial peoples he delays the formation of that unity of struggle between the white workers and coloured workers which is the foundation of Socialist society.

Pertinax, of *l'Echo de Paris*, had expressed the view that countries like Abyssinia, Liberia and China should never have been allowed to cross the threshold of the establishment at Geneva, while Mussolini remarked, "Has the League of Nations become the tribunal before which all the negroes and uncivilised peoples, all the world's savages can bring the great nations which have revolutioned and transformed humanity?"

To attack the League of Nations and the policy of collective security, however, is no less harmful to the interests of the colonial peoples and of the exploited masses in the conquering countries than to raise the racial issue of coloured versus white workers. Both lines of policy are reactionary. It must be remembered, too, that in defence of Abyssinia sanctions were applied to the aggressor for the first time since the creation of the League, and so powerful was their effect that the Governments of Britain and France, not wishing Italy to be defeated, decided that sanctions must be lifted. In Italy food prices had steeply mounted, agricultural workers earning six liras a day in wages had to pay 2½ liras for a kilogram of spaghetti, 1½ liras for a kilogram of bread 5 liras for a piece of soap, and 5 liras for a litre of paraffin. In Sicily the workers invaded the food shops. The nation's financial position was desperate. Italy was approaching economic collapse. The British and French Governments determined to save her. Mr. Chamberlain, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, declared that it would be mid-summer madness to retain sanctions.

It is, however, with reference to the policy of the Soviet Union towards Abyssinia, that the line of Mr. Padmore is so misleading as to be emphatically mischievous. On p. 153 he writes: "At every phase of this disgraceful business the Abyssinians were tricked, deceived and led to the slaughter by the League . . . . while the Soviet Union sat by and never lifted one finger to aid the victim. Instead, she supplied oats, coal and petroleum to the aggressor throughout the war."

Now it is well known that the Soviet Government had been pressing from the beginning of the war for the application of sanctions by the League of Nations against Italy who had been declared the aggressor. To quote Nicoletti in the *International Press Correspondence*: "The Soviet Union alone dealt with the problem of sanctions from the viewpoint of principle, and accepted the economic sacrifices which would result from the application of more effective sanctions (as demanded by Litvinov since the beginning of the Fascist aggression.)"

It is to be inferred from Mr. Padmore's disdain of the policy of preserving peace by means of collective action through the League of Nations that he would have expected to see the Soviet Union apply sanctions to Italy single-handed. This is to attribute to the Soviet Union the character of an imperialist Power, which is obviously an egregious error.

One is sorry that Mr. Padmore in treating the question of Africa and World Peace should not have dealt more fully with the emergence only this year of Egypt as an independent nation, member of the League of Nations, although

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

still bound by a Treaty of Military Alliance with Britain. Under this Treaty joint Anglo-Egyptian imperialist rule is established over the Sudan, an area even vaster than Ethiopia.

Actually the policy of the British Government throughout the Abyssinian crisis was largely determined by their own imperialist ambitions in Egypt and the Sudan. The Egyptians were alarmed by the Italian inroad into East Africa and threw themselves into the arms of Britain for protection. This change in the status of Egypt has not brought any benefit to the masses of the Egyptian people, who are still harnessed to the machinery of Imperialism. It would have been interesting to learn Mr. Padmore's opinion on the new status of Egypt and the Sudan in reference to world peace.

Mr. Padmore opens his book with a dedication to his friend Edgar Andre, and the quotation from Lenin that " only a proletarian Socialist Revolution is able to lead humanity out of the blind alley created by Imperialism and imperialist war," and ends with an appeal to his comrade workers to hold high their revolutionary banner and unite their forces, but the arguments which he presents in the book are of a nature to divide the workers of the world.

REGINALD BRIDGEMAN.

A FORERUNNER OF DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

Diderot, Interpreter of Nature. Edited by Jonathan Kemp. (Lawrence and Wishart.) pp. 358. 10s. 6d.

OF all the materialists of the 18th century, Diderot best repays study. A comprehensive study by a Russian appeared last year in French (reviewed in the LABOUR MONTHLY for October, 1936), and this volume of English translations is a timely aid to a closer knowledge of this great thinker. Mr. Kemp puts together here most of Diderot's important writings on the theory of nature, together with some of his best work on morals. The translation, by Jean Stewart and J. Kemp, is remarkably good. The selection is well done, among the books translated being the *Conversation between d'Alembert and Diderot, D'Alembert's Dream, On the Interpretation of Nature*, and *Rameau's Nephew*. The only important work one misses is the *Letter on the Blind*, which contains an open exposition of Diderot's sensationalism (and cost him a spell in prison).

The primary aim of the editor has been to establish the connexion between Diderot's materialism and dialectical materialism. In the Introduction and the Notes he gives passages from Marx, Engels and Lenin to illustrate where Diderot approaches and uses the method of dialectical materialism. Except in one or two excellent elucidations of Diderot's theory of physiology, Mr. Kemp rather too modestly restricts himself to highly suggestive appositions. But he offers to the student a wealth of parallels which cannot fail to stimulate. From this point of view he has admirably fulfilled the task of an editor, particularly in those sections dealing with the theory of nature.

The editorship is not quite adequate in the section dealing with the theory of society (morals). The editor does not say enough about the exuberant, rather extravagant character of Diderot, and about his social connexions ; and fails to point out the mixture of conservatism and paradoxicalness, almost anarchism, in his ethical thought. In *Rameau's Nephew*, for instance, what Diderot expounds is the antithesis between an ideal, general morality and a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

realistic, private one. To get on in the world, to satisfy his needs and desires, Rameau's nephew advocates a selfish, "debased" morality; on the other side Diderot finds no adequate answer in his idealistic creed of humanitarianism, moderation, etc. The conclusion is not dialectical, but sceptical.

It is different with his ideas on nature. Though much of his thought is necessarily speculative, owing to the limitations of contemporary science, it is precisely because of his use of the dialectical method that he comes to amazing results. Beginning with a sensationalism built on Locke, he is much more thorough-going than the latter. There is no such thing as abstract ideas, he says; ideas mirror reality. Abstract ideas are merely generalisations from things (p. 116). Thoughts derive from sensations (p. 25); but instead of losing himself in the phenomenism of Condillac he tackles the ensuing problem dialectically, and states that sensation, together with consciousness, life, etc., are properties of matter (p. 58). When matter is organised in a certain way, consciousness is born (p. 57).

To explain this, again, he has recourse to true dialectical thinking, and comes to the concept of evolution. All biological forms we know, he says, are the product of a long growth from other forms (pp. 28-9, 72-78). Concerning the method of this development he could know little, of course; but it is interesting to see Diderot suggesting the two main theses of the evolutionary doctrines of the 19th century, evolution through the survival of the fittest (p. 28), and evolution through will-power (p. 78).

The general principle of Diderot's approach is summed up in his definition of matter. In strong distinction to the majority of his contemporaries he opposes the notion that matter is "equally indifferent to motion and to rest." Matter is always in motion; "motion is a quality as real as length, breadth and depth" (pp. 127-9). Place and time are not external to matter. "I cannot separate, even abstractly, place and duration from existence. These two properties are therefore essential to it" (p. 135). Thus the definition of a thing includes the whole genesis of the thing (p. 86). Diderot solves the old hen-egg problem by showing that you must trace back this biological form to earlier, more primitive ones (p. 53).

This volume of selections brings home to us the mastery and brilliance of Diderot's thought. We recognise in it the theoretical expression of the attitude to nature of the rising bourgeoisie, the bourgeois mastery of nature in the interests of industry and wealth. It is peculiarly fitting that these ideas, so much ahead of their times, are the products of the guiding mind of the great French Encyclopedia; and that most of the works translated in this book were published posthumously, only after the French Revolution. It is salutary to be reminded of the difficulties which beset Diderot, of the constant threat of suppression and imprisonment under which he worked.

R. PASCAL.

WOMEN TO-DAY

Women Must Choose. By Hilary Newitt. (Victor Gollancz.) 7s. 6d. (Left Book Club edition, 2s. 6d.).

THIS book gives a complete picture of the position of women in Europe to-day, showing their legal, economic and political status. It also provides an answer to those who think that, in this country at any rate,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the woman's problem has ceased to exist and that women can rest content with what has been achieved.

The most interesting and complete section in this book is that dealing with women under Fascism. All of us have heard a great deal about the sufferings of women in Fascist countries, concentration camps and prisons, about measures debarring women from entering professions, etc., but this book reveals much more than that. It shows that Fascism has affected the lives of the great majority of women, from the industrial worker and housewife to the peasant woman and domestic worker ; that it has created a vast propaganda and drill machinery (League of German Girls, Women's Labour Service, Household Year), designed to cover every phase of women's activities and to mould their minds according to the needs of the Nazi State.

The degree of freedom enjoyed by women in Western democratic countries varies. In most of them (with the exception of Latin countries where the influence of the Napoleonic Code is still felt) they have won the political franchise. In most of them women in industry are an established factor (as cheap labour), but are debarred from better-paid jobs. Discrimination exists against married women in professions. Social services have been extended. But in the sphere of employment, " where the woman's real position within the democratic countries can be recognised," " it remains true that women's pay is low in practically every occupation. The report presented to the Sheffield Conference of Labour Women says that scandalous conditions exist in the catering trades. For example, figures from the confectionery, drapery, grocery and boot departments show that wages ranging from 7s. 6d. and 10s. per week are paid. The total rate of mortality in England from childbirth and pregnancy is increasing, the death rate of babies under four weeks of age is very little below what it was twenty years ago.

The author drives forcibly home a point often glossed over, that the degree of political freedom depends on economic realities ; political freedom is a great asset, but " it loses its efficacy when it is regulated and determined by economic forces owned and controlled by an ever-dwindling minority."

The author deliberately refrains from drawing conclusions, but her facts speak for themselves. Women Must Choose ! We are not living in an oasis. Achievements won in the past are not stable and are threatened in every country.

The position of women in the only Socialist country, the Soviet Union, can be summarised by the article in the new Soviet Constitution dealing with women's rights :

> Women in the U.S.S.R. are accorded equal rights with men in all fields of economic, State, cultural, social and political life.
>
> The possibility of realising these rights of women is ensured by affording women equally with men the right to work, payment for work, rest, social insurance and education, State protection of the interest of mother and child, granting pregnancy leave with pay, and the provision of a wide network of maternity homes, nurseries and kindergartens.

The author shows that this emancipation of women in Russia went side by side with the emancipation of the working class as a whole, and that the complete solution of the woman's question is possible under Socialism, whilst the struggle of the working class against capitalism must be unsuccessful unless women are drawn into it.

TAMARA RUST.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A BOOK WITH A PURPOSE

Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx. By Karl Kautsky. (N.C.L.C. Publishing Society.) 2s. 6d.

EVEN the publishers feel constrained to warn readers of this book against the indiscriminate mixing of terms which takes place in it. In their prefatory warning they venture a little sermonising on their own and succeed in demonstrating their lack of knowledge as to what constitutes the value of a commodity ; that, however, is by the way.

As to the book itself. Regarding the social character of the exchange mode we are told that " commodity production is a social type of production " (page 9) and then that capitalism might attempt to overcome its contradictions by the "abolition of the social character of labour, to a return to simple commodity production " (page 244). It would appear that the value of commodities under simple commodity production does not arise from the " social character of labour." From whence then does it arise ? The petty commodity producer is endowed with the capacity of being a creator of surplus value (page 71). Marx states specifically : " the unity of the labour process and the process of creating value, is production of commodities . . . . the unity of the labour process and the process of producing surplus-value is the capitalist process of production " (page 179, Vol. I Glaisher Edition). On page 12 we are informed confidentially that " There are even (!) use-values which are not the products of value." It is true there are products which are use-values and not the product of labour, i.e., sunshine, air, running water, etc., and it is also true there are products of labour which have use-value and have no value (as in communist society), but since when did we have use-values which are the product of value ? We also discover that the " primary object of a commodity is to be exchanged " (page 12). How can an inanimate commodity set for itself an " object ? " This is fetishism with a vengeance.

Regarding value we get a similar jumble. The labour of the worker does not transfer to the commodity but " reproduces " (page 197) the value of the constant capital. We are also told that the doubling of the productivity of a bobbin-maker, for example, " has no influence on the value of labour power " (page 122). It would seem as this could only be the case if the worker denied himself the luxury of clothes, but such is not the case, for the secret is revealed on page 167 where we discover that " if the yarn is cheaper, the weaver . . . . can produce more without any greater outlay on raw materials, his income grows." So it was the blackguard weaver who collared the results of the increased productivity of the bobbin-maker, which made cheaper yarn possible. Yet even this fact we are not sure about, because on page 181 we are told that a fall in the value of yarn " reacts upon the value of the means of life of the worker, for example, his clothing."

Dealing with the distribution of the surplus-value amongst the capitalists through the equalisation of the rate of profit we are informed that this " does not serve to explain . . . . but rather to obscure " the relationship between the working class and the capitalist class. In Vol. III. of Capital, page 232, Marx shows that it is precisely this equalisation which shows that " the capitalists as a whole in each particular sphere of production are participants in the exploitation of the total working class and that they are interested " in the degree of that exploitation, not only out of general class sympathy, but also for direct economic reasons." It is precisely the *class aspect* of this question which Marx does stress.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the question of the circulation of commodities we are told " The circulation of commodities is *essentially different* (reviewers' emphasis) from the direct exchange of commodities or barter " (page 37), while on page 46 it says " In the beginnings of commodity circulation two commodities are always directly exchanged, *as in the case of barter* " (reviewer's emphasis). To achieve this sleight-of-hand trick, the first half of the metamorphosis of the commodity, i.e., C-M is treated as though it were the complete metamorphosis C-M-C, and is compared to a barter transaction where the exchange of commodities C-C completes the metamorphosis without the intervention of money.

The historical background of capitalism when not deliberately avoided (" it is no part of our purpose to investigate how the exchange of commodities reacted on the mode of production " (page 9) is treated idealistically. " Luckily for capital, the feudal nobility was looking after its business . . . . the feudal lords gradually resolved . . . . to become commodity producers " (pages 234-5). In a similar fashion the destruction of the independent artisan is treated in a vacuum without any consideration to the actual facts of the case. The weaver " becomes impoverished and is obliged to sell his loom," he must " hire himself out to a capitalist " who will buy a loom and set the weaver to work. " Perhaps the loom the capitalist bought is the same " that the weaver was compelled to sell, so he will resume work " in the same manner as before, the labour process has undergone no essential change " (page 67). But is not the impoverishment of the hand-weavers due to the fact that the labour-process has undergone a change, and that he has to compete with the machine process ?

Since 1889 the working class has struggled for the 8-hour working day. " Its tenacious struggle was eventually crowned with success." What is the crown ? The Washington Agreement of 1919 ! It is admitted that " the ratification of this agreement in the most important capitalist countries has been prevented " (page 113). Not a word about the tenacious struggle of the Russian workers who won a 7-hour day, not in an empty paper agreement, but in reality.

What Kautsky thinks about the U.S.S.R., where the teachings of Marx are finding practical application, is not mentioned in this book, but in another book, *The Labour Revolution*, published in 1925, almost simultaneously with the first English print of the present edition of the work under review, his hatred of the U.S.S.R. is open and plain. He says : " It is a legitimate inference from Marx's words that the destruction of the existing state machinery of Russia is an indispensable preliminary to any working-class progress " (page 66, *Labour Revolution*). What Kautsky preaches, Trotsky endeavours to realise, as the recent trials in the Soviet Union have demonstrated. Kautsky presents Marx's teachings with a purpose, the purpose of distortion of Marxism and the elimination from it of all its revolutionary content.

T. CAMPBELL.

THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

Raw Materials or War Materials. By Alfred Plummer. (Gollancz.) 3s. 6d.
The League and the Future of the Collective System. (Allen and Unwin.) 7s. 6d.

DR. PLUMMER, in his *Raw Materials or War Materials*, produces much matter in support of his contention that the question of colonies and raw materials is one of the struggle for imperialist power. The second part of his book is devoted to showing that the demand for raw materials by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Fascist States is really the demand for war materials. He suggests that this problem can only be dealt with if we have a real Collective system, if we achieve disarmament . . . . and then establish *international* control of colonies and raw materials.

The trouble is that in putting forward these ifs and buts we have still scarcely started to consider the real burning and vital problems of the day. One could wish that Dr. Plummer were more emphatic in stating that our first point in considering whether colonial territories should be redistributed or not is *what the colonial peoples themselves have to say about it all.* At one place in Dr. Plummer's book there is a brief and passing reference to this, but it is clear that it does not strike him as a primary consideration.

The League and the Future of the Collective System is a collection of lectures given last August at the Geneva Institute of International Relations by students of various nationalities, including Mr. Herbert Morrison, Mr. Leonard Barnes, Mr. Andrew Rothstein and others. As in all such compilations of lectures the grains of wheat are hidden in a considerable quantity of chaff. Mr. Rothstein gives a simple and clear explanation of the principles and outstanding facts of the Soviet Peace policy, but most speakers were clearly oppressed by recent failures of the League. Dr. Fritz Berber, Nazi representative, explains the passionate enthusiasm for peace of Herr Hitler and attacks in twenty pages almost every constructive and realist proposal of collective security that has been made or operated. He particularly attacks the proposal for Regional Pacts on the very same grounds as those on which the Soviet Union supports them—that they could provide a basis on which the principles of the Covenant would have a chance of operating.

There is a good deal of talk about the danger of the League or of Regional Pacts " degenerating into military alliances." The League itself is an alliance. Collective Security means nothing more than that a number of peace-desiring States should act together to defend peace against aggressors. This is an alliance for a definite purpose. And to act means to use military as well as other force. All who desire peace and want to be effective in their efforts to obtain it should get such things clear.

GORE GRAHAM.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Every member of our staff has a personal interest in YOUR job.....

that is the effect of Co-partnership and naturally it reflects in the quality of the work.

Every man takes a personal pride in the job he is doing because it is the reputation of his House which is at stake and he knows that he will share the rewards of a job well done.

The staff of the Leicester Co-operative Printing Society is welded together by common interests as Shareholders of the Society. Social organisation and education create an atmosphere of contentment and unity in which the craftsman can give of his best.

That is why L.C.P.S. Print is finer and L.C.P.S. Service is better. You can easily prove it !

FINE PRINT BY EVERY PROCESS

Leicester Co-operative Printing Society Ltd.,

99 CHURCH GATE, LEICESTER. Telephone 58204

Branches at London and Kettering

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Published by the Proprietors, the Trinity Trust, 7 John Street, W.C.1, and Printed by the Leicester Co-operative Printing Society Limited, 99 Church Gate, Leicester.

PRODUCED 2008 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED